

was not said in the debate on the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne but upon the setting-up of the joint committee:

In his later years Joseph Howe said this:

A wise nation gathers up its records, preserves its muniments, and fosters national pride and love of country by perpetual reference to the sacrifices and glories of the past.

We have often heard that quotation, and Joseph Howe was a very great Canadian. Senator Lambert went on to say:

It seems to me that at this time, as we in common with the rest of the world enter upon a new era of history, a Canadian flag should suggest these things increasingly to the mind of our people. It is this thought which should be ever present with the members of the joint committee that will be appointed after the adoption of this resolution.

Senator Lambert was chairman of the committee, and an excellent chairman. I was a member of the House of Commons when this committee sat, as were some other of my colleagues here. Day in and day out, week in and week out, they considered over 2,000 samples, as I shall call them, of flags that were submitted to them. They came to a conclusion. They had a vote, and by a majority of 23 to 1 they recommended a certain flag. It had the Union Jack in the corner and a maple leaf on the fly. The report was never brought before Parliament.

Senator Lambert said last night—and he was more or less correct—that there was a little controversy over the size of the Union Jack. Nobody wanted to discard the Union Jack, but there was a little controversy over the size of it on the proposed flag. Apart from that, there was general approval. It is my opinion—and it was my opinion when I was a member of the House of Commons—that had this report of the committee been brought before Parliament it would have received the support of an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons, and I am sure it would have been passed by the Senate, and we would have had a flag today without all this fuss and nonsense. However, I am told that there were certain few people then who did not want the Union Jack at all, and that that was the reason why it was discarded.

Honourable senators, there are other quotations that I could make, but I shall not do so. I did intend reading some excerpts from the letter of May 27, 1964 that was addressed to the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson by certain outstanding gentlemen. Senator

Zuzyk has already read from it. This letter was signed by such men as Dr. Forsey, Dr. Creighton, Professor W. L. Morton, the President of Trent University, barristers, doctors and so on. They are very outstanding men from every walk of life across Canada. I do not think it will be harmful if I quote just two paragraphs:

We are not in the position of a country with a revolutionary tradition, creating itself anew; we exist because we have inherited the past without a revolutionary upheaval. It is false and dispiriting to adopt a flag which subtly ignores the truth of our own nature. This is not the kind of symbol to rally a bewildered and demoralized nation.

This is addressed to the Prime Minister of Canada:

We respectfully suggest that you withdraw the maple leaf design—

As honourable Senator Connolly (Ottawa West) called to our attention, this refers to the design with the three maple leaves, but whether it was a design with three maple leaves or one maple leaf does not make any difference to their argument.

We respectfully suggest that you withdraw the maple leaf design for the time being, and that you convoke at once a private meeting of the parliamentary leaders of all parties to agree upon a new design which asserts our history.

That is what the people of Canada want—a flag that asserts their history.

We profoundly believe that the present proposal will only deepen the spiritual malaise of Canada.

All honourable senators received a copy of this letter, and they are familiar with its contents.

May I be pardoned, honourable senators, if I make some remarks that have been made before? A flag designed on the basis of our amendment would perpetuate both the traditional designs, as has been suggested, for which our soldiers have fought in two world wars, and would reflect the long history of a unique racial partnership. Such origins should be perpetuated proudly, and not buried in the bland anonymity of a piece of white bunting. A flag is intended to stir emotions, not to dampen them. Only a flag such as we have suggested can truly reflect this nation's pride in its past, and its aspirations for the future.

Some say: Why bother with our pride in the past? Let us only live for the present and the future. I say that no great nation does that.