

will not like for many years to come, if ever they do? Not if we can prevent it.

I hope, as I said at the beginning, that the sober second thought of the Senate will exercise itself and that we shall vote for this amendment. If we do so, I believe we shall be preserving, and will preserve for the future the unity of our country.

Hon. Walter M. Aseltine: Honourable senators, I just wish to speak briefly, both to the amendment and to the flag issue generally.

I think that congratulations are in order as to the manner in which this debate has been conducted. I will mention the speech of the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Connolly, Ottawa West), of the honourable Senator O'Leary (Carleton), the one we heard this evening from our friend and colleague from Three Rivers (Hon. Mr. Méthot), and the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Brooks)—a fighting speech, I may say. All these speeches were well thought out and ably delivered.

I deeply regret that I was absent yesterday when 15 senators spoke on this debate. At that time Senator Pearson and I were on a very trying mission. In a day and a night we travelled over 4,000 miles. On that account, I hope honourable senators will pardon me if I have not prepared my remarks as well as I would otherwise have done, for I have really not had the opportunity to do so.

From the speeches I have heard, and others which were delivered yesterday, which I have read briefly, it is quite obvious that the Senate of Canada is making an honest attempt to give this controversial matter a good, sober second thought.

I believe I have said something before in this chamber with respect to my ancestral background. My people settled in what is now the United States, in the State of Pennsylvania, many years ago. They settled there when the states of that time were colonies of Britain, and they settled under the Union Jack, as the flag was constituted at that time. The Cross of St. Patrick was not yet in the Union Jack. They were greatly attracted to the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, and the other freedoms that flag bestowed upon them.

After the rebellion, my people became known as United Empire Loyalists, because they remained loyal to the mother country under whose flag they lived. They received such terrible treatment that they were obliged to give up all of their property—their land, horses and cattle, and their homes, furniture, all their personal effects—and emigrate to another country.

If that had taken place nowadays, they would be called D.P.'s—displaced persons.

My ancestors were certainly D.P.'s in those days. They came to Canada and settled in the district along the Bay of Quinte, in the Province of Ontario. I was born at Napanee. My people lived in the Bay of Quinte district also under the Union Jack, and later on under the Red Ensign. There they found and enjoyed freedom of speech, freedom of religion and freedom to live one's own life. They certainly revered the Union Jack and the Red Ensign, and so did I, and have done all my life, and I cannot dissociate myself from doing so at this time.

I intended to speak at some length about what happened in 1945 and 1946 with respect to the selection of a distinctive national flag, and to compare what happened then with what has and is happening now. Much to my surprise, however, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Brooks) stole some of my thunder. However, one reason for mentioning this is that I was a member of the first committee which was set up in 1945.

I have before me the *Debates of the Senate* for 1945. At page 285 the following resolution was introduced in the Senate by the Honourable Wishart McL. Robertson:

That in the opinion of the Senate it is expedient that Canada possess a distinctive national flag . . .

Now comes the important part:

That the Senate do unite with the House of Commons in the appointment of a joint committee of both Houses to consider and report upon a suitable design for such a flag.

And listen to this:

That the honourable Senators David, Davies, Gershaw, Gouin, Howden, Johnston, Lambert, Léger, McRae, Quinn, Robinson and White be appointed to act on behalf of the Senate as members of the joint committee.

Shortly after the committee commenced its proceedings, I took the place of Senator McRae, as he was unable to be present.

That is the way it was done in 1945, and that is the way, in my opinion, it should have been done in 1964.

Honourable senators will realize that five of the members of that committee are still members of the Senate and taking an active part in the work of this chamber, namely, Senators Davies, Gouin, Gershaw, Lambert and Aseltine.

The committee sat, and Senator Lambert and the Honourable Walter Harris of the House of Commons were made joint chairmen. And believe me they were good chairmen, handling its business completely to my satisfaction, at any rate.