

Let us unite these in terms of work, in terms of achievement, in terms of legislation and justice in the solution of the spectres of poverty and unemployment, and let us bring a solution to the problem of automation, and provide those realities in terms of education, health and high living standards. These are the concrete realities which will give meaning and purpose to this new flag in Canada. I venture to suggest that in a short time Canadians will be just as proud of the new flag as any Britisher is of the Union Jack or anyone in the United States is of the Stars and Stripes. It will depend on what meaning we give to it in terms of the things we do, as Canadians, in attempting to solve our problems.

Honourable senators, I had not intended to speak today—what I say is completely off the cuff—but I am delighted with the standard of the discussion, up to this point at any rate, and the tone of conciliation. I believe that we have an opportunity today to justify the responsibility and the trust that has been assigned to us in constituting this the house of sober second thought.

I respect Senator Grattan O'Leary's desire to have another flag, or to come up with another design. I do not think that suggestion is practical. I do not care how much time you gave the committee to do it, you would get no more unanimity than you have at the present time. So I say, let us get behind the design we have and give it meaning and purpose in terms of the potentiality of Canada today. Then, in 10 years it will be the symbol of a united people, through which French, English, Ukrainian, German and even Chinese and Japanese will feel this has meaning to them in terms of opportunity, of justice and of freedom—opportunity that is equalled in no other country in the world. That is the challenge to us today; that is a challenge I am sure all Canadians can and will live up to.

Hon. Arthur M. Pearson: Honourable senators, it was not my intention to speak today. However, I have hurriedly prepared a few notes.

First, I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Government for his words of wisdom and moderation in speaking to the motion. I would also like to congratulate our principal speaker on this side, Senator Grattan O'Leary, for the wonderful address he has delivered. I feel quite moved when I listen to an Irishman speak; and he is one of the best of Irish speakers.

Senator Crerar has said that we should have a distinctive flag. Senator Cameron supported this view, and mentioned a dictionary he had with him which carried a picture of

the Peruvian flag. I looked up the Peruvian flag in a dictionary I have, and noted that it is exactly the same as this proposed flag, except that the Peruvian flag has a coat of arms where the proposed Canadian flag has a red maple leaf. At a distance you would not know which flag you were flying, the Peruvian or the Canadian. It might be that if you had one flying in this chamber you could tell the difference right away, but I do not think you could from any distance.

Honourable senators, at the outset I want to say that I love my French compatriots—I think a great deal of them. They are so very hospitable; they love their homes. And what emotion could be more admirable in a man than that he loves his family and his home? They love their church, and from a Christian point of view that is a wonderful emotion.

On the trip down from the west to Ottawa we very frequently have a French hostess on the Air Canada plane. These hostesses are typical of the French people. They are asked to do a job, to make the passengers on the plane comfortable, and in doing so they inject their whole personality into their work. This is so typical of the French make-up, they inject their whole personality into their work, and everyone feels much better for their presence. This is the attitude of the French hostesses, God bless them, and we love it when we travel on the planes. It is typical of all Canadians in Quebec.

However, having said that, I want to emphasize that Quebec has a number of very serious problems. Among such problems are, first, the rural slums in back areas of Quebec; second, there is the lower educational standard among the general populace. These two problems make it very difficult to fit the average man into either a technical or white collar job. So, economics is an important problem in Quebec.

Now let me get down to this amendment. Quebec has been led through a series of emotional concepts. In 1958 the party presently in power federally lost its hold in Quebec at the polls. Again, in 1963 it suffered a serious loss. The question is, what to do to strengthen the position of the party in relation to that overwhelming vote in Quebec and so return the present Government in 1965 or 1966, or whenever the next election occurs.

These are surmises on my part, but one of the first things the present Government did was set up a commission on bilingualism and biculturalism. As was anticipated, this has caused dissension in Canada. In particular, it appealed to the rebellious and noisy young people in Quebec, who are demanding their rights from the English people—from those