

word "distinctive". It is true that many different ideas of distinction have crept into this debate. Unfortunately, most people seem to have accepted what I call the "beatnik" idea of distinction. We all know that beatniks like to discard the customs and they like to wear the same style of dress, so that they become a sort of characterless mass in order to be distinct. I feel that we may be following a certain amount of this trend in our desire to be distinct.

I like to describe those who would completely obliterate our past as nihilites, from the Latin *nihil*, meaning "nothing". They would completely ignore our past and our traditions.

I ask you, honourable senators, who are really the more distinctive, those who would ignore everything of the past or those who would like to point to our traditions, our racial origin and the contributions of various races?

I am sure honourable Senator Pouliot would be rather surprised, in view of some of the comments on this side of the house, if I were to pay him a compliment. I listened with interest when he was describing his family's history in the Province of Quebec. I would like to think of him, not only as distinctive but as distinct.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Not extinct.

Hon. Mr. Phillips: No, not extinct.

Before discussing in detail the amendment proposed by the honourable Senator Grattan O'Leary, I would like to mention one aspect of the resolution which is causing grave concern all across Canada. I am convinced that at the next general election, possibly in the near future, the Government will use, as an excuse for its many dismal failures, the fact that it is a minority government. In this same vein, many Canadians ask where this Government gets its mandate to force upon us the flag of its choice. I am reminded of a scene in Julius Caesar. Cassius and Brutus are conversing, prior to the assassination of Caesar, and Cassius says to Brutus:

Now, in the names of all the gods at once,

Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed,

That he is grown so great?

You will excuse me for paraphrasing this by saying: Upon what votes doth this our Pearson feed, that he is grown so great?

Honourable senators, think of the support which was used to force this flag through the House of Commons—that unholy alliance, Mr. Caouette and Mr. Fisher. I wonder if they have that much in common with the Canadian people that this alliance should

have been utilized to force the flag through the other place.

I have enjoyed the speeches in the Senate. By their very nature and by their content, they have clearly demonstrated to the Canadian people the wisdom and the necessity of having this upper chamber. There has been a difference of opinion, and this of course is to be expected in any debate. If there were no difference of opinion there could be no debate.

There are several remarks to which I should like to refer. I am sure no offence was intended in those remarks, and I hope honourable senators will find no offence in mine. One thing which has been referred to several times is that the gravestones of our war dead can have the maple leaf emblazoned on them. I dislike the idea of bringing in reference to the graves of our fallen heroes as a means of supporting this flag. Those men made a voluntary contribution, the supreme sacrifice, and I feel they have given enough; they have given their all to Canada, and we should not try to utilize them in this debate.

Senator Hugessen made many interesting remarks yesterday. He was troubled by some small things, which seemed to give him much annoyance. I should like to refer to his remark that it would be impossible to have negotiations while we have the present Leader of the Opposition. I feel this remark was entirely wrong. I am sure the honourable senator was aware that it was the Leader of the Opposition who first advocated a committee to study flag designs, to attempt to find some compromise in the other house. It took him six weeks to get a committee, except on terms that were not entirely to his liking, but there was a spirit of negotiation there and an indication that it was not all obstruction.

Hon. Mr. Leonard: Would the honourable senator permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Phillips: Certainly, sir.

Hon. Mr. Leonard: I think the honourable senator has not quoted correctly the remarks of honourable Senator Hugessen. The word he used was not "negotiation" but "agreement". There is a difference between the two words.

Hon. Mr. Phillips: I may have misquoted, but I do not feel there is much difference between "agreement" and "negotiation". We would hope that agreement would follow negotiation.

I should like to refer to the remarks of honourable Senator Hollett last evening. I must say that I enjoyed the sincerity with which they were made. I believe he was the