

must say often with good manners, sometimes with great debating skill—and only a few seem to have failed to try to understand what the amendment was about. But as I listened to their criticisms, as I heard them advance first one reason and then another, against the amendment, I was compelled to wonder if ever I could have devised an amendment that would have induced those gentlemen to vote for it.

If I may say so, as a very junior member of this house, this is not in the traditions or in the spirit of this house. I sat in the galleries of this house years and years ago and saw men on both sides rise up in their places and not support their political parties in the other place. I am not going to question the motives or the sincerity of any person in this house. I am one of those who believe John Morley's dictum, that the important thing in life is not that two people should agree but that each should hold his convictions in a high and worthy way.

I think the debate in this house these past few days has been conducted with good manners and in a civilized way, and for that I think we can congratulate ourselves. But what does shatter me a bit is what a moment ago I called the tenacity of the support of honourable senators on the other side for a measure which only came to us a few days ago, in the origin or completion of which they had nothing whatever to do.

Yesterday, as I listened to speech after speech on the other side, I felt like saying with Cromwell to the Long Parliament:

I beseech you gentlemen, by the bowels of Christ, to consider the possibility of your being wrong.

I am not going to try to answer tonight the criticisms that have been made of my amendment, though I think I could controvert them without the slightest difficulty, but I am sure it would only be an exercise in absolute futility.

So, before taking my leave of the debate, I would like to say this. I have had great admiration for the speeches delivered on both sides of the house. I have already expressed my admiration for the manner in which Senator Connolly (Ottawa West) presented his motion to the house, but the speech in this house which moved me most deeply, because I think it went to the very heart of this question—it went to the very heart of the reason for my moving this amendment—was the speech delivered this afternoon by the honourable Senator White.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. O'Leary (Carleton):** I think he told this house the truth, that millions of

people in this land tonight, rightly or wrongly—and it matters little—will feel that they are being given a flag conceived in political partisanship. And, by the way, no political party should ever be given the title deeds to the flag of a nation. That is what is happening now and that is what will be told on platforms all over this land in the coming election—"We gave you a distinctive national flag." Yes, honourable senators, a flag conceived in political partisanship, a flag born in bitter political controversy, a flag imposed on this nation by closure, and a flag which, in a few days, will be unfurled from the Peace Tower in utter national disunity. That, honourable senators, is a bad thing for our common country.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, it is moved by honourable Senator Connolly, P.C., seconded by honourable Senator Vaillancourt:

That this house do recommend to the Government that such steps as may be necessary be taken to have designated as the National Flag of Canada a red flag of the proportions two by length and one by width, containing in its centre a white square, the width of the flag, bearing a single red maple leaf, or in heraldic terms, described as *gules on a Canadian pale argent a maple leaf of the first*.

In amendment, it is moved by honourable Senator O'Leary (Carleton), seconded by honourable Senator Grosart:

In amendment, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "Government" and substituting therefor "that the Government suspend further action on the proposal for a new Canadian flag in order to give reasonable time to the people and Parliament of Canada to reach agreement on a flag which will incorporate appropriate symbols of the founding peoples of this nation and which will be acceptable to all elements of our population".

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion in amendment?

Those in favour of the amendment will please say "Content".

**Some Hon. Senators:** Content.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Those against the amendment will please say "Non-Content".

**Some Hon. Senators:** Non-content.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** In my opinion, the Non-contents have it.

**Hon. Mr. Brooks:** Mr. Speaker—

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Call in the senators.