

I am from Rivière du Loup. I am from the Province of Quebec, but I am also a Canadian, and I am proud of it.

Now, honourable colleagues, what shall we do? How long will you prolong this discussion? What will you have to say about Quebec? What has the Laurendeau-Dunton Royal Commission to do with the Canadian flag? Was that royal commission set up to appease Quebec? Quebec does not have to be appeased, and I have said so many times. The question of the flag exists from the beginning, from a long time ago. If you go back to the volumes of *Hansard* of the 1920's, you will see that the first one who mentioned a Canadian flag at the House of Commons was Cameron McIntosh of The Battlefords, a member whose name should be remembered. What was the flag that he proposed? It was the Red Ensign. That was the beginning. He was a pioneer. His suggestion was the first one for a national flag.

Afterwards, there was an infinity of models of flags. There was the flag of the League, one red triangle, and one white triangle with a green maple leaf in between. I cannot see that any man with a head on his shoulders would propose such a flag. Another one which is proposed is a flag with three triangles. According to the science of heraldry, triangular flags are the flags of the illegitimate branch of the family. They were not proud to propose such flags.

I have written a series of articles in *La Presse* to the same effect as what my learned friend Senator Cameron has said, to tell the readers of *La Presse* what were the different flags of the world. There was the flag of Siam with an emblem on it—it was an elephant. Yet the members of the Opposition said in the House of Commons that no country had its emblem on its national flag. But you did not look at the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* which is here, and which I have also at home. My colleagues may not have looked at the pictures of flags that we find in every school dictionary, when half of the national flags of the world contain the emblems of their countries. I am not questioning the good faith of my colleague. A man of his importance has no excuse to make such a speech, even for the best possible motive. I have a right to disagree, and I do disagree with my friend. I may have disagreed with all my friends, but this time I know that what I am telling you, honourable senators—it is the sentiment of the immense maturity not only of the Province of Quebec but of the whole country.

When you speak of soldiers, we can speak of soldiers. We can speak of the Legion. Who is heading the Legion? It is mostly Imperials. I can speak of the Imperials, because I may

be the only member who had the honour to receive a resolution of felicitation from the Imperials of the British Army in Toronto, when I spoke to the honorary colonels. The leaders of the Legion do not represent the sentiments of the members, of the rank and file of the army, navy and air force, any more than the leaders of labour unions represent the feelings of the members of their unions.

Hon. Mr. O'Leary (Antigonish-Guysborough): That is not correct.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: What is not correct?

Hon. Mr. O'Leary (Antigonish-Guysborough): Your last statement.

Hon. Mr. Croll: Do not argue with him.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: Senator Croll tells me not to argue. I will listen to him and he will be my adviser.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: He knows.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: With the experience I have, I shall not discuss it here, but when you come to my office I will show you the files of murder by army doctors, and many others.

On motion of honourable Senator Irvine, debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. A. J. Brooks: May I ask the honourable Leader of the Government what he has in mind for the sittings of the Senate for the rest of the week?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): First of all, I think everyone agrees that we have made a fine beginning on this debate this afternoon. I understand from members opposite that some of them are not prepared to continue the discussion this evening. In these circumstances, I think it appropriate that we should not sit this evening.

I think we should consider continuing the debate until a conclusion. I would hope that we would resume the debate tomorrow afternoon—Senator Irvine will open at that time—and we should plan, if we do not finish tomorrow afternoon, to sit in the evenings until a reasonable hour. I am not talking about a late, late session tomorrow. We can continue on Thursday. I do not know how long it is planned to continue the debate, but I do know that many senators desire to speak and it is not the intention of anybody on this side to restrict participation in the debate in any way.

Honourable senators, may I say that there appears to have been some misunderstanding last night. I hope that honourable senators will believe me when I say that when I gave notice of the motion which has been presented this