

I am 100 per cent in favour of this kind of thinking. This is the reason I will vote for the amendment. A great majority of the country is not in favour of the flag proposed in this motion; as a matter of fact not one would be ready to vote for it if he had not in mind that we are going to have a second flag, one that would clear the conscience of those who would vote for the first one.

The definition of a flag, which I mentioned at the beginning, is that it must be a sign around which a party can rally. This does not, in the present case, mean one party only, but "Canada as a whole party," as was the case in 1867 when Confederation came into being as the product of the Liberal-Conservative party—everybody being united to decide on the British North America Act. On that subject you can read the speeches that were made later on, even by the Honourable Honoré Mercier, when he spoke on Confederation—and he was the Prime Minister of Quebec and a Liberal.

Can we say that the flag proposed is the result of agreement by the whole of Canada? I think it is exactly the contrary. When I saw people in my city carrying this new flag on their automobiles, I was able to see, without being in error, that it was carried by a *porte-étendard* of only one group of our country, a group supporting the Liberal party.

To try to obtain the consent of a larger group, I noticed yesterday that my good friend, Senator Hugessen, was telling those who were against the new flag, or, at least, not much in favour, that we were going to have another flag. This idea could even be noticed in the main motion, because if we read it we note the words: "That this house recommend to the Government that steps... be taken to have designated as the national flag of Canada..."

In his speech, the Leader of the Government, (Hon. Mr. Connolly, Ottawa West) spoke of a national flag. In the French version, we have the words "comme drapeau du Canada et non comme le drapeau du Canada;" those three different designations meaning that we may, in the very near future, be asked to vote for another flag. I think this would hold Canada up to ridicule.

Does that mean that the motion is asking us to vote for something that we are going to be ashamed of, or for something that we need to correct by a second vote?

**Hon. Mr. Choquette:** Order.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Méthot:** I will not say anything more now, except to add that we are really confronted by a motion proposing to have a negative flag, not a distinctive one, which will have to be corrected by another.

(Translation):

Honourable senators, I cannot bring this to a close without recalling the speech made by the honourable Senator O'Leary, who proposed the amendment. I already knew his eloquence, I already knew his vigour, but never before had I had the opportunity of appreciating his wisdom as I did the other day.

Another point I should like to add is that I am a French Canadian, both on my father's and my mother's side. Our immediate forebears were born in Trois Rivières or in the vicinity. I have practised law in my area for some 45-odd years and, with the exception of the last few years, my clientele as well as my practice has been 100 per cent French Canadian.

No one asked me, in order to succeed in life, to repudiate my origins; no one asked me to make concessions. I have never made any concessions, nor have I repudiated my origins.

Honourable senators, I may tell you that we must all preserve the memory of our origins. It is all very well to look to the future and then to the past. It is all very well to say that the Conservatives are not progressive, because in order to be progressive, we should forget those who preceded us. That is not the situation. I believe that on the other hand we should retain our origins.

We realize that in Canada various races live together, in a spirit of unity, and that they progress together.

Let us preserve our origin, whether we be Anglo-Saxons, Scots, French, Jews or of any other race. But we must be united in Canada, and in order to do so, we must not repudiate anything; no one asks us to do so. Let our laws be respected, and Canada will continue to develop as it has done since 1867.

(Text):

**Hon. A. J. Brooks:** Honourable senators, it is not my intention to detain you for any length of time, but I do wish to say a few words in this important debate.

May I say at the outset that I have been very proud indeed to listen to the remarks of my colleagues on this side of the house, and especially to hear what I think are the unanswerable arguments they have presented in support of our amendment.

Before entering into the particulars of this debate, I wish to make it clear that I am not the last speaker for our party on this side. The honourable Senator Asetine will be speaking after me. He had a long and tiresome trip to the west and back, and we