

*Canadian Flag*

and promised consideration when I mentioned that here was a very good example of two eras of colonial control in a city. The Fort LaTour period to which I am referring extended from 1631 to 1645 and it was the first major French outpost in New Brunswick. Prior to that time there were two earlier phases of Indian life. The story of the first English settlement on the Saint John river more than a century after the LaTour-D'Aulnay struggle between two rival French traders is recalled by the well known trading posts associated with the Simonds, Hazen and White period. Thus, at Portland point in Saint John are significant historical phases in the lives of three racial strains, Indians, French and English. Each has played an important role in the history of our province. When to these are added the famous Loyalist settlement one has a good idea of the different strains in our city and province.

I think it is important to understand why the Loyalists came to New Brunswick. They were a unique group comprising many well educated men and certainly men of great principle. Not nearly enough credit has been given in our history books to these gallant exiles. Some have suggested that had they found in their midst in the United States a true leader such as George Washington they might have remained there and brought about a different course of history. But they did not hesitate. They brought with them their valuable possessions, their education and culture, but above all else their love of a monarchical form of government. They were not interested in republicanism in any form. That is why in New Brunswick and Saint John we have such a pleasant mixture of culture from which many can take a lesson. We have a pleasant blend of American heritage with a true love for the crown, not a blind obedience but an appreciation of the monarchy as a better form of government than a republic.

It is important to define what one means by "imperialism" and I go to the work, "Canadians In The Making", by Professor A. R. M. Lower. On page 349 he states:

Canadian imperialism has never been simple; it can at one and the same time be bitterly contemptuous of Englishmen and warmly welcome the British connection. A newspaper in that most loyal of all Canadian cities, Saint John, could write, apropos of a book by an English traveller: "Canadians might never suspect how coarse, ignorant, conceited and, withal, amusing they are if talented Englishmen did not come out occasionally and write books about them." Imperialism was in its own way a kind of Canadian nationalism.

In supporting the subamendment put forward by the hon. member for Regina City [Mr. Bell.]

(Mr. More) I want to say at the beginning that I feel a subject such as the flag should not have been brought up for debate in the house. I liken it to capital punishment. It is a very emotional subject. People take positions for different reasons and it is extremely difficult to get a truly free vote on such a subject. In addition, of course, bitter controversy enters the picture.

However, we are involved in a historic debate to which many good contributions have been made. I do not wish to single out any but I think that speeches both inside and outside the house have been worthy of commendation on all sides. I noticed that last night the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean), a good friend of mine, made a contribution to the debate, and I give him credit for doing so. I do not agree with his thoughts. I think it must have been extremely difficult for him to make that speech. He is a member of the Royal Canadian Legion, active in the boy scouts, a veteran of the first world war and is of Scottish ancestry. His riding is almost completely associated with the British tradition. Yet he came out in favour of the new flag which, of course, means scrapping the red ensign.

I have always been interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) about a republic. I find it difficult to believe there is support for a republic in his riding and I can only say he is either foolhardy or he knows what his people are thinking. It strikes me that in a historic place like Lotbinière the people would certainly have great respect for the monarchical form of government.

I was also interested in the speech of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) the other day. Everybody in the house knows he is a very active Anglican layman, and I say more power to him. But in his speech he disowned completely the red ensign and its historic traditions and connections with the Anglican church. He made absolutely no reference to it. I am not criticizing his stand but I think he should have tried to explain this change in his thinking.

We have also had, of course, the famous speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) which has been given so much attention. I can only say that it represented a walking of the plank such as we have not seen since the days of Captain Bligh. Hon. members may ask when I think the flag crisis became serious, and I should like to go back to the 1940's for a moment. I lay the entire blame on the Liberal party