

very poorly represented on the board of directors of the Canadian National Railways.

I will not dot my "i's" nor cross my "t's" today, but tomorrow I may do so unless there is a satisfactory result in the meantime.

Just before I entered this chamber today I met colleagues who informed me that they suffered from the same stupid arrangements in other parts of the country. Apparently the management of the Canadian National Railways think that they are infallible and never make a mistake. In this case, they are making a gross mistake. I insist on a prompt solution of the problem.

CANADIAN FLAG

MOTION FOR DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL EMBLEM—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. John J. Connolly moved, pursuant to notice:

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*.

He said: Honourable senators, the resolution to establish a distinctive Canadian flag, as the nation approaches the centenary of its foundation, must be assessed in the background of the nation's history; and we can remind ourselves today, as this year's celebrations in Prince Edward Island remind us so forcibly, that Confederation in its genesis was both accidental and experimental.

In 1864 the four Atlantic colonies had decided to investigate legislative and fiscal arrangements which would bind them more closely together for their mutual advantage. At that time in the Canadas, parliamentary deadlock had stifled progress. All the colonies of British North America too had a sense of danger resulting from unrest and civil strife in the United States. In this atmosphere the concept of a larger union of the British colonies in America took hold. It stimulated the imagination of statesmen from the Maritime areas, as from the Canadas alike. It began as an idea of mere colonial union; but the vision of a new North American nation stretching from sea to sea soon emerged. The British North America Act provided the framework upon which the new nation could be built.

We should remind ourselves too that all this development was evolutionary. Revolution and armed uprising formed no part of

the process. It was the antithesis of the severance of old moorings as had happened a century before in the United States. This was characteristic also of the revolutionary movements in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, but it was not true of British North America. The new organization was to be a federation founded upon the familiar British institutions; the parliamentary system would prevail; British assistance, sharing of experience and, indeed, British supervision would continue, though many of the trappings of colonialism were bound to disappear in time.

In the Confederation Debates Macdonald referred to the ultimate emergence of a nation "friendly" to Britain. And minority rights, consecrated over a century before in the Quebec Act, and, contrary to all earlier imperial policy, granted in the terms of capitulation of Montreal and Quebec, were reaffirmed. In one respect the recognition of these minority rights was the Ark of the Covenant. We should remember too that if the formation of the federation was, in a sense, fortuitous its development as a federation was to be gradual. Nor was its development always easy. The financial implications for the small populations in the dispersed colonies were rather overwhelming. So too were the physical tasks. Communications were primitive; the populations within the colonies were sparse and scattered; education and the means thereof were restricted. Wealth there was, but it was undiscovered. The separate economies were local and lean.

It is not for me here to trace the domestic development of the past century which transformed this fledgling association into a modern industrial and commercial society. Successive generations of Canadians have shouldered this gigantic task with intrepid courage, with intelligence and with imagination. Successive generations of politicians have forged the policies to achieve the subdual and the development of a vast continental empire. Politics there were, but no political party does or should claim sole credit. A new nation was being built. The people who were here at the outset and their descendants and the hundreds of thousands of new people who came here, to them is the credit.

There was help from abroad: capital, know-how, expertise. A developing nation needs this help desperately, and how well we see that today in the modern, new and developing nations. There was in this new nation on the new continent a feeling of self-reliance, a determination on the part of its peoples to provide self-help. These qualities have underwritten the glorious achievement, the great domestic experiment which has now proved itself as Canada.