

of our inheritance. I was shocked at the manner in which the publicly-owned C.B.C. and the editors of certain newspapers have attacked him. As one who has had some slight experience in libel law and, if I may say, as one who has acted as counsel for Canada's largest newspaper, may I say it is obvious beyond words that these attacks are not only malevolent, malicious, defamatory and sadistic, but they are downright nonsense, trash, nasty and insulting.

Why are they so bold? Why are they so bold as to attack the former Prime Minister because of his stand on this flag question? Is it because he refused to reply to personal attacks? Is it because they know he will not reply to personal attacks on himself?

In connection with this matter may I say that I have urged upon the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition in the other place that he issue a writ of libel against some of the pip-squeaks in the C.B.C. who have been attacking him, and to single out some editor as a defendant in a libel action. But, no, he always refuses, pointing out that the purpose of a libel action is to clear one's fair name and reputation, and not to punish others. He feels that his fair name will be cleared at the polls, not by a jury of twelve but by a population of 19 million.

But what a pity it is that in discussing a subject like that of a flag the prejudice and hatred of man towards man should exemplify itself by the poor, partisan, miserable attacks on the former Prime Minister.

Now, enough of that. But is it not correct, that the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition in the other place is right on this flag question, just as he was right on the Arrow, just as he was right on the devaluation of the dollar, just as he was right on Canada's participation in NATO? He was damned at the time because of his decisions in respect of those matters, just as he is being criticized at the present time.

May I suggest that we are all, including the Right Honourable Mr. Diefenbaker, sick and tired of this protracted debate. The debate was worthwhile in an effort to preserve for Canada the symbols which we hold dear. He was fighting, not to save a piece of bunting but to maintain a principle, to maintain the symbol of all that Canada holds dear, past, present and future.

What next? May I respectfully suggest, and predict, not as a prophet of doom, but as one who watches our love of Canada wane from year to year and our traditions ignored from year to year—

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Wax from year to year.

Hon. Mr. Walker: One person who waxes happy is the honourable Leader of the Government. We are talking now about Canada, its symbols, its tradition. In the minds of the public they are one. The next move which you will see, if I am correct—and if I am not I may be told so—will be directed towards the abolition of the monarchy. The next move will be an effort to take Canada out of the British Commonwealth, and the next will be to make Canada a republic.

Honourable senators, my concluding words to you are these, that powerful forces are now working in this country to destroy what we hold dear to us. They gloated over the "axe job" that happened yesterday. It is not too late to stop their assault and to renew our faith in Canada, to preserve—we do not care how, whether it is in the Red Ensign or in some other design—some vestige of our inheritance, some vestige of our traditions, by including in some way the Union Jack and the fleur-de-lis.

Honourable senators, I trust we may all think seriously about this matter and give some deep concern to the amendment proposed by the honourable Senator O'Leary (Carleton). This is our last chance. We are separating the nation now as it never has been separated before. Many senators on the other side have expressed their personal opinions, and they have been quoted in the press, supporting the Red Ensign. I am looking forward to seeing them rise in this house, to express their desire to see the Red Ensign, or some other design including the Union Jack and the fleur-de-lis, carried on as a symbol of all that we hold dear, past, present and future.

Hon. Donald Cameron: Honourable senators, I find myself in the same position as that of many of my colleagues tonight. I have some sympathy at this moment for my friend Senator Choquette, who opposed the motion last night ostensibly because his colleagues were not ready to go on with this discussion. I little expected that, less than 24 hours later, I would find myself on my feet saying what I have to say. However, this speech is not one which Leonard W. Brockington, one of Canada's most distinguished lawyers would call "The most carefully prepared extemporaneous speech ever given." It is certainly extemporaneous and is not carefully prepared, but it comes from the heart.

I intend to start by complimenting those of my colleagues who have preceded me. They have well maintained the tradition of this house, and they have lent distinction to this particular debate. In saying that, I refer to the debate in the whole of the Canadian Parliament.