

to express my regret at their untimely deaths. We shall miss them. Senator Brunt from Hanover, who was Deputy Leader of the Government, and whose cheerful and friendly ways endeared him to us all will, I feel, be particularly missed. As I was in Britain when I read of his death, I wrote a tribute to him and sent it to Sir William Haley, editor of the *London Times*, who very kindly published it.

Honourable senators, I shall be as brief as I can in discussing the Speech from the Throne. I did not hear it delivered, but I have read it through carefully a couple of times, and would like to say a few words about several matters referred to in it. I shall not deal with the main parts of the speech; they have been analysed by abler speakers than I.

We have been told the Throne Speech indicates that the country is in very good shape financially and is improving. We have also been told that there is something seriously wrong with the country. All I want to say is that I do hope all the plans that have been laid for developing the country will not lead to an increase in taxes. As the senator from Banff (Hon. Mr. Cameron) stated, we are a country of only 18 million people and there is a limit to what money we can raise and spend.

We have become a welfare state and we are now beginning to realize how costly it is to make all these worthwhile contributions to comfortable living. This year we shall probably spend a total of about \$7 billion. We find it hard to believe that before the war of 1939-45 we were budgeting each year for something less than half a billion dollars.

I am glad to see that the Government expects the committee which is looking into the matter of unemployment insurance to report this autumn. I hope the report will recommend making this insurance scheme less of a burden on the taxpayer than it is today.

I have previously expressed myself, when a Liberal Government was in power, on the matter of old age pensions and I do not want to labour that question now. I do feel, however, that until the old age pension is entirely contributory and not dependent on a tax on corporate and private incomes, there should be some means test for such pensions and persons with incomes over a stated amount should not be entitled to them.

I see by the Speech from the Throne that the Government intends to invite the provinces to a conference with a view to looking into the matter of changing our national flag. Many of you will remember that some years ago the late Right Honourable MacKenzie King set up a joint committee of the

Senate and the House of Commons with the same object in view. I was a member of that committee, and I recall that the honourable senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) was the joint chairman for the Senate. I have very vivid recollections of our hearings. One group led by the late J. R. MacNicol of Toronto would not agree to a flag which did not have the Union Jack on it; another group would not have the Union Jack on Canada's national flag at any price. There was no compromise and eventually the committee was disbanded without reaching any useful conclusion.

During the sittings members of the committee were flooded with hundreds of designs. School children, whose teachers evidently had some views on the matter, sent us letters by the dozens submitting designs which in many cases were quite ridiculous.

Personally, I do not see anything wrong with the Canadian Red Ensign, and I am sure there are several million Canadians who are equally content with it. But the Red Ensign does not please everyone. Every so often one reads a letter in the press condemning the Red Ensign as a national flag.

My own opinion is that we should have a national flag representative of the two great races of this country, the English and the French. I should like to see a flag which embraces both the Union Jack and the Fleur-de-lis. Those of British and French descent make up about two-thirds of the population of Canada, and they have contributed the major share to our development. Therefore, I feel that it is quite right that both should be represented in our national flag. But I see no object in adopting a flag which recognizes neither. At the same time, when we are dealing with this matter of a flag I wonder why we cannot make it possible for Canada to have a national flag representing the English and French domination of the country, and also let each province have its own flag for use within Canada. I understand that Nova Scotia has a flag of its own. Why then should not each province have its own flag? It seems to me that would please a great many people and would give each province a new distinction.

There is nothing new in this idea. The Union Jack is the flag of Britain, but the Welsh, as you know, are strange people and as a part of Britain's population have their own flag and national anthem. At my summer place in Wales I have two flag poles. While we are in residence we fly two flags: the longer pole, the Canadian Red Ensign, and on the shorter one, the Red Dragon of Wales. As the main feature of its design, the Welsh flag