

I represent—a people who have a great appreciation of the past, who have a deep love of tradition, and who, in spite of recent events, still have great confidence in the future. We find ourselves greatly disturbed by trends in Canada. May I illustrate this by pointing out that while many people in the Province of Quebec were objecting to Her Majesty's visit—and I do not want to leave the impression that they all were—

Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt: No, no; please permit me to protest against that remark. The people of Quebec were not against the visit of the Queen. What trouble there was was caused by strangers and some people from the United States.

Hon. Mr. Phillips: I am very glad to hear the honourable senator's correction, for at that time the town council and citizens of Summerside were complaining that Her Majesty's car was being driven through the town at too fast a speed and that the children who were waiting to welcome her did not have an opportunity of seeing her. I mention these things to demonstrate to you that there is a great love of tradition in our province.

During the past year the history of our province, its traditions and accomplishments, were acknowledged in Centennial Days. Every town and village on the Island had a Centennial Day, and in this way we all became very much aware of our history and, I may say, of the contribution of the two founding nations. We do not like the term "the two ethnic groups"; we prefer to call them the two founding races.

We are very proud of the fact that in our province people of French and English origin live in harmony. We of Anglo-Saxon descent find much that we can admire in our Acadian friends, who are most co-operative and excellent neighbours. They have contributed much to our province. They have given us a premier, a chief justice and many outstanding men in all walks of life. In short, we are proud of the past. We are very proud of our nation, and we feel that we all have a common purpose, privilege and responsibility. We are very proud to be called Canadians, regardless of our racial origin.

Consequently, we do not have the strong desire to change our flag that many other Canadians have. Honourable senators will note I said "change our flag." It was, and is, our feeling that we had a flag in the Canadian Ensign. I prefer the term "Canadian Ensign" to "Red Ensign".

Honourable senators, I cannot recall a politician or member of any party making a speech advocating the so-called distinctive Canadian flag in our province. Members of all parties chose to ignore the campaign literature advocating a so-called distinctive

flag—and here I am admitting that the campaign literature of all parties did call for a distinctive Canadian flag. We saw far more important things in the campaign literature, such as projects that would contribute more to the development of Canada and, in particular, to the Atlantic provinces. It is said that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. We in Prince Edward Island say that the political road travelled by politicians from central Canada is paved with broken promises. Perhaps we ignored the literature dealing with a distinctive flag, expecting this to receive the same treatment.

Hence, we are puzzled and, indeed, saddened by the haste to change our flag. We ask: Why this indecent haste? Why this sudden condemnation of all our traditions? Why the substitution of an emblem for our heritage? We also ask: Who is behind this move? Who has elevated the flag issue to a place of utmost importance, and, indeed, who has seen fit to make it the only business of our Parliament? This subject, which has monopolized the time of Parliament, did not even warrant a place in the Speech from the Throne.

We ask: Who, and why, in a space of three months catapulted the flag issue to the position of priority? Throughout the whole lengthy debate no one has given us an answer. Our people have made sacrifices in the past, and are willing to make more sacrifices. If it is necessary to have a distinctive flag we shall again make sacrifices, but, first, there are certain aspects of this issue that must be clarified. We must have some means of selecting a flag design. There must be some method which permits us to have some say, or an opportunity to express our views, in the selection of the design.

You may refer to the lengthy debate in the other place and say that an opportunity was provided there. I cannot agree with that view because the original design was imposed on Parliament. No one knows the method of selection of the original flag design by the Prime Minister, and no one knows his purpose.

Honourable senators, if I may digress for a moment, I will say that I am proud of the contribution of the two members from Queens, the Honourable J. Angus MacLean and Mr. Heath Macquarrie, in that debate. At all times they put forward a reasonable conciliatory viewpoint, and one in which I would like to join. Unfortunately, the other two members from the province sat in silent, sullen submission. They shared in the reluctance of their Liberal colleagues to seize an opportunity that could have given their party an honoured place in history.

We must have also a description—a clarification, if you will—of that much maligned