

*National Anthem*

may appeal to the people. There can be no such thing as competition in matters of this kind. These are in the realm of spontaneous expressions of loyalty to Canada which the different sections of our population find most suited to them. What they are expressing either by one anthem or another is in fact their allegiance, and the means they choose I have no doubt is the one which they feel best expresses what they have in mind.

It is my view that as a House of Commons we should exercise great care before interfering with any expression of loyalty by the people; because when they sing either "God Save the King" or "O Canada" they are expressing their own deep feeling. We should encourage our people to express themselves in their own way, because when they do so they speak from the heart rather than from the mind.

After all, loyalty is a sentiment springing from the heart, and in my view one which we should encourage. Whatever may be the individual views of hon. members, I believe we must be tolerant and not be too dogmatic in the positions we take where people's sensibilities are involved. We must exercise extreme care when as a House of Commons we contemplate legislation involving a matter of sentiment, particularly when there are so many ways of expressing loyalty.

I do not think any person, whether he prefers the singing of "O Canada" to that of "God Save the King," or would like to have both—and there are great numbers in that category—would like to be told that by a majority of parliament he has been placed in a strait-jacket as to the manner in which he is to be permitted to express his loyalty to Canada.

For that reason I say we should not put a fence between those groups who want one thing and those who want another. On the contrary we must take all the fences down and let the people have freedom of expression in their manner of worship, and of song, and of praise and loyalty.

Let me say to the hon. member who has moved this resolution—for whom I have deep respect because of his genial manner and his generally reasonable approach to problems coming before the house—that sometimes it has been found, in international as well as in national affairs, that we do not gain what we desire to gain by the process of spelling out too definitely what we have in mind. Sentiment and loyalty do not lend themselves to being spelled out or put in statute form. I am not so sure that we might not hinder our expressions of loyalty if we were to attempt to incorporate them in a statute of parliament.

[Mr. Graydon.]

Following this point of view I think we have to go back to some things that have really exemplified the feelings of people of this nation. I shall never forget the visit of Their Majesties to Canada before the war. I suppose for most people it is one of the most memorable events in our history. I can remember standing beside another hon. member in the Senate chamber and making some remark with respect to Their Majesties. But he was unable to speak—and he was not the only one—because sentiment and loyalty had gripped him in a way in which no statute, no words, nothing that this parliament could enact could do. After all, there was the king of Canada to whom we were paying homage. People in all parts of Canada vied with one another to show their loyalty.

After all it was not only that His Majesty was the embodiment or symbol of our constitutional monarchy; I think the presence of Their Majesties in Canada was an evidence to people who were of the Christian faith that here were a king and a queen who exemplified the purest form of family life, who were examples not only to Canada but to the rest of the world.

I can remember other indications of how far sentiment can go. I can remember when for the first time I was a humble representative of Canada at an international assembly. I can remember the tug at my heart-strings when we seven delegates walked into the San Francisco conference and received the plaudits of representatives of nations far and wide, an indication of Canada's popularity. I do not think I was ever so proud to be a Canadian and to subscribe to the Canadian way of life as I was when we entered that great auditorium to attend the conference.

These are things that cannot be overlooked when we are setting up a foundation for the building of a great nation. It is all very well to talk of our material advantages, great and important though they may be; it may be important to talk of our political way of life and our institutions generally—I am not asking for priority for any of these aspects of our national life—but we should not overlook the pride and devoted loyalty of the people of Canada to this country and to what it stands for. These things should always be in the forefront of our minds.

Demonstration of loyalty can be made in different ways. I should like to see our people able to do it in different ways, in the way that will best express their loyalty to this country. But when the tumult and the shouting and the oratory have died away, I wonder if in the final analysis there is any place in the world where this dominant feature of loyalty and deep and genuine affec-