

service. We were never ashamed of our flag but, to say the least, it was rather confusing at times.

I shall continue, if I may, in a nautical vein for a few minutes, because I think it is in that area of our economy that in the past most of the confusion has existed.

We have in Canada, as most senators know, three ensigns—the White, flown by ships of the Royal Canadian Navy; the Blue, flown by ships in our Government service and by merchant ships with a specified number of commissioned officers and other ranks of naval reserve personnel as crew members; and finally, the Red Ensign, flown by Canada's merchant vessels, which is the same Red Ensign as we know ashore as the Canadian flag. But it is at this point that I really enter the realm of confusion. Both the Blue Ensign and the Red Ensign have the coat of arms inscribed on them, but, as many of you know, the White Ensign has not. It is the same ensign as is flown by the British navy.

For the purpose of emphasis, I repeat that the identical flag is flown by ships of two different nations, and it is this similarity that exists in our present use of the Red Ensign which gives me cause to support the use of a distinctive flag of our own.

To avoid confusion—or rather in an attempt to avoid it—the naval service, on their own, decided a few years ago to put shoulder tabs on all personnel, reading “CANADA”. This has been mentioned earlier in this chamber. That took care of the situation while the troops were ashore. On the ships themselves they painted a maple leaf on the funnel—yes, this same maple leaf we are discussing today and which I have heard derided in this chamber during the last few days.

From this point onward, anything I might be tempted to say would be repetitious—perhaps I am already guilty of being so. I therefore propose to make this perhaps the shortest speech yet made on the subject in either chamber, and I hope one of the last. I would add that Senator Baird seems to have outdone me. However, there is one thought I would like to leave with you.

All of us, at one time or another, have stood proudly while a band played “The Maple Leaf Forever”. I earnestly hope that all of us will in the future be proud to stand while the maple leaf flies above us—forever!

Honourable senators, in closing I wish to say I shall be supporting the resolution.

The Honourable the Speaker called it 6 o'clock and left the Chair until 7.30 o'clock.

At 7.30 p.m. the sitting was resumed.

Hon. Paul Yuzyk: Honourable senators, I would like to express my gratitude and congratulations to the honourable Leader of the Government in this house, Senator Connolly, and to the spokesman of the loyal Opposition, Senator Grattan O'Leary, for their lucid presentation of two points of view regarding the design of the Canadian flag. Senator Connolly gave us a scholarly historical sketch of Canada's evolution from colonies to national autonomy and sovereignty, and the arguments favouring the maple leaf as the sole distinctive symbol in our flag. Senator O'Leary made an eloquent plea for the retention in the Canadian flag of the symbols of the founding peoples which would be accepted by all elements of our population.

At this time the eyes of all Canadians throughout our country are focused on the Senate. Our people are expecting us to exercise deep thinking, prudence, moderation and a high degree of non-partisanship, ever bearing in mind the best interests of Canada, and, above all, national unity. We are reminded that justice, truth, fair play and conciliation are the true spirits of the Senate. These are high principles to live up to, but we must always be motivated by them.

The Senate is confronted with the issue of a flag that was passed in the other house by a large majority, but not without resort to closure. The new flag did not receive the support of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. A considerable proportion of the population is vehemently opposed to this flag. It is being introduced in disunity, turmoil and bitterness. This situation is bad—very bad. A flag should be a unifying, not a divisive thing. It is obvious that Canadians are not yet ready for their distinctive flag commanding the support of an overwhelming majority. It is my humble and sincere opinion that the Senate should insist on a flag of unity that has the support of all parties and all elements of our population. Only then can we be sure that our flag will inspire Canadian unity and pride.

At this time I feel I would be remiss if I did not bring to the attention of honourable senators an open letter sent to the Prime Minister and dated May 27 of this year. It was signed by such distinguished Canadian historians as Professor D. G. Creighton of the University of Toronto, Professor W. L. Morton of the University of Manitoba, Dr. Eugene Forsey, Research Director of the Canadian Labour Congress, and several other prominent Canadian scholars, administrators and artists. Written before the commencement of the flag debate in the other house, this message, with