

our birth, to choose Canada. We or our fathers were actuated by the same impulses which one or two or three centuries earlier had led the forebears of the honourable members, whether they spoke English or French, to make this same venturesome, sometimes desperate, move from an old world to a new. So we made our choice, gambled our lives and those of our families, and by and large we won. Not without pain were the deep-grown roots of generations wrenched from the familiar soil, but mercifully soon we found new roots were taking hold in new, far more nourishing clay than we had ever known. We settled into the new scene as gradually the old one faded.

This was Canada for us. This is in the background of every Canadian. What we left behind and what we brought to this country were the customs, manners, anthems, languages, and not the least of all, flags.

For some Canadians, history takes them back to the fleur-de-lis or to the Union Jack; for others, it is some less familiar banner but nonetheless dear to them for all that. These old attachments are slow to die in a new country, and perhaps this is as it should be. It has often been said that Canada is not a melting pot like the United States. Someone has coined the word "mosaic" to describe the fabric of our society. The fact seems to be that, for better or for worse, Canadians do not melt. It is my firm belief and hope, however, that we can and do unite. This, to my way of thinking, is a much more fruitful and rewarding concept than a melting pot or even a mosaic.

I like to think that Canada represents a union of diverse people, much of whose innate strength comes from the very fact that they have not forgotten their diverse past. But I think that which is important about this flag debate which we are experiencing now is that it should be directed not to the past but to the future.

Honourable Senator O'Leary (Carleton) made a fine contribution to the debate, at a very high level. It was the eloquence of O'Leary; it was O'Leary at his best.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Croll: It was a delight to listen to him and hard to disagree with him, but I was able to do so.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: You made it.

Hon. Mr. Croll: Yes, I made it. When I found out that he was going to move the amendment, I hoped that it would be imaginative, that it would be new and startling. When I saw it, I was rather surprised, for I found it not only innocuous but ineffective and, in

the circumstances, I felt it was meaningless. Here he was, by means of the amendment, tenaciously grasping for yesterday, and through his own will he was immutably stuck with yesterday's mistakes.

What does Senator O'Leary want by the amendment? He wants more time. Time for what? Time is the thing we have the least of. So far as I am concerned, time is running out. After 97 years, I want the flag now, and I cannot wait. So far as I am concerned, the amendment holds out no hope for any solution.

Honourable senators, we must remember that, within our lifetime—indeed, within the last 20 years—the substance of Canada has been changing, perhaps more rapidly than at any other time in our history. Many of the old ways and the old outlooks no longer are appropriate. If the winds of change have been blowing over the great African continent for years, can anyone say that any country, including Canada, has not felt them? Perhaps we are a little too close to the forest to see anything but the trees; but change there is in this country of ours, and more change lies in store than most of us could have imagined 20 years ago.

I am not one given to predictions or to prophecy, but I venture to say that before another 20 years have passed there will be profound changes in some of the most significant aspects of Canadian life.

Does anyone think that even the Constitution of Canada will not undergo major changes within the next decade? Does anyone think that the great debate which is going on in Canada today will not produce far-reaching changes in our social and educational structure? Does anyone think that Canada can just "stand pat" in the world of today?

Honourable senators, I do not wish to stray from the theme of the debate, but we must view the question of a national flag for this country in its true perspective. Like everything else, the symbols of Canada are changing too.

I well remember the school reader we used, when I was a small boy in Windsor. The frontispiece was a stirring composite of a battleship at sea, surmounted by the Union Jack and the Sovereign, and under it was the caption "One flag, one fleet, one throne". That motto is no longer valid. The old Empire has changed beyond recognition. The colonies have become nations in their own right. They have their own flags and their own fleets, and if they have not their own thrones, they do not seem to have any trouble in finding their own presidents.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: Are you recommending that?