

it consists also of a needless departure from parliamentary precedent in our own country.

Compare and contrast if you will, the action taken in 1945 by a seemingly much more responsible government, in regard to the issue of symbols of our nationhood which required consideration at that time. Did the government of that day throw the flag question willy-nilly into the House of Commons? Would either the Right Honourable Mr. MacKenzie King, or the Right Honourable Mr. Louis St. Laurent do anything like that? The answer is definitely no. The government of that day did what any wise government, without thought or expectation of political advantage, would reasonably do: It appointed a committee of Parliament, not only a committee of the House of Commons, but of the Senate and the House of Commons. To my mind, that was proper, highly proper, and conformed in those circumstances to the best traditions of a democratic society such as our own.

I have referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the Flag of 1945-46. I have read our Senate *Hansard* of the time, and I have read most of the proceedings of the committee. Let me pay my tribute to one member of that committee who is here today, the honourable Senator Lambert, who was a joint chairman of the committee. The record discloses that he did an extraordinary amount of work and played a tremendous part in all the proceedings of the committee of that day.

Any one who is really interested in this question should pay to Senator Lambert the honour of reading the speech that he delivered, when the resolution for the appointment of the committee came to this house in 1945. It is thoughtful and thought-provoking. Perhaps he might express the identical views today as he did then, I do not know. However, I suggest that this speech revolved largely around the question of what is a "distinctive national flag." And I am well aware of the fact that Senator Lambert was one of the 23 persons out of 24 who voted on the final report of that committee, which decided in 1946 that the flag then approved by that committee, and which included the Union Jack in the top left corner, was a "distinctive Canadian flag". Certainly this selection could not be confused with any other, except at a distance, when, indeed any flag can be confused with another.

However, it was interesting to me to note a statement made by Joseph Howe quoted in Senator Lambert's speech as appears in Senate *Hansard* of November 21, 1945, at page 301:

A wise nation gathers up its records, preserves its muniments, and fosters national pride and love of country by perpetual reference to the sacrifices and glories of the past.

Senator Lambert concluded his speech as follows:

It seems to me that at this time, as we in common with the rest of the world enter upon a new era of history, a Canadian flag should suggest these things increasingly to the mind of our people. It is this thought which should be ever present with the members of the joint committee that will be appointed after the adoption of this resolution.

The honourable Senator Lambert, for whom I have always had the highest regard, may suggest that I have quoted him somewhat out of context. If I have done so, no doubt he will make reference to the fact. I merely wished to quote part of his speech.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Halifax North):** Would the honourable senator permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson:** Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Halifax North):** In view of his reference to the utterances of Joseph Howe, it seems to me that the implication is created that because there may be a new national flag, one would desecrate the graves of illustrious ancestors. Would he say that that was correct?

**Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson:** I doubt very much if the honourable senator's question is relevant to this discussion. I think perhaps I should not be sidetracked by answering at this stage.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Halifax North):** A nice way of avoiding it!

**Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson:** It would take too long to answer.

I want to say that I hope that Senator Lambert still believes in the principle he enunciated so many years ago. Indeed, don't we all?

A flag should represent the glories of our past, and the greatness of our heritage. Why not, therefore, join with us in support of Senator O'Leary's amendment? It envisages, I believe, a joint committee of this house and the other place—men of good will coming together, as they did 18 and 19 years ago. This time, however, I suggest that we need such a procedure, not only to select designs for a flag for Canada, but also for the purpose of binding the wounds and repairing the broken hearts of those who have been so