

was surprised to hear him state that he did not consider the Red Ensign a distinctive Canadian flag. I am not sure whether he was in the cabinet in 1945, but if he was not, the men who wrote these words were his colleagues just a short time before.

Now I wish to deal with some of the speeches made on the Speech from the Throne of that year, and while I do not intend to quote extensively from them, nevertheless, I would like to cite one in particular. I refer to the speech of the honourable Senator Hugessen who, I regret to see, is not here this evening. He made a very eloquent speech. I might say, honourable senators, that during the first session I was a member of the Senate I had so little to do, since I was not on any of the committees, I spent a considerable amount of time reading from the speeches of senators in days gone by. I found it to be a very gratifying and rewarding task. Few people are aware of the great wealth there is in the Senate *Hansard*. There you have speeches of men like Meighen and Dandurand and many others. I place Senator Hugessen among those men who have made the fine speeches and also, I may add, Senator Lambert and many others who are still members of this house. I refer you in particular to part of the speech which had to do with the setting up of the committee on a flag, where Senator Hugessen had this to say:

Now I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am proud of the Union Jack . . . It gives me a thrill to see it flutter in the breeze.

Senator Horner, our late, dear friend, asked: "What is the matter with it now?" Senator Hugessen went on to say:

The fact remains that it is the flag of Great Britain.

That is right.

It has no particular designation to show that it has any special connection with Canada—

And I say that that is not what the Government is arguing in the other place at the present time.

—and, as the Speech from the Throne indicated, I think it is now time for us, like the other members of the British Commonwealth, to design a flag of our own.

He went on further to say:

I have given some thought to this question of a national flag, and for what it may be worth, I offer some suggestions to the House. It seems to me that it should fulfil three requirements. First, it should incorporate in a position of prominence and honour the Union Jack.

This is Senator Hugessen, who spoke in this chamber last night and defended the new flag, and opposed the amendment of Honourable Senator O'Leary.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: He must have forgotten what he said in 1945.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: There must be some reason. He went on:

The second essential to my mind, is that it should include in a position of prominence and honour some symbol or design to represent the blood of France that flows in the veins of nearly one-third of our citizens.

That is what we are saying in our amendment.

The third requirement should be that our flag must bear some symbol or emblem that is distinctive of our own country, and which all the world will recognize as such. I suggest that the emblem might be, for instance, the maple leaf or some similar emblem. A fourth element which I think would be desirable, is that our national flag should be as simple in design as possible.

One would almost think that Senator Hugessen had prepared the amendment that we are now presenting to the Senate.

There were other speeches. The late Senator Duff, coming as he did originally from Newfoundland and later from Nova Scotia, made a strong appeal for the Ensign and for the Union Jack. Senator Kinley spoke. His only objection to the Ensign at that time—and he did not really object to it—was that he thought it might be our flag with some modification. He said it was a flag that was flown on ships at sea. I have been told, and I think anyone who lives in a seaport will realize, that half the flags of the world are flown on both land and sea. That is no objection to it.

Senator Hugessen made the speech I have referred to on October 3, 1945, and I was reading from page 36 of the *Debates of the Senate* of 1945. I ask myself and all honourable senators—and I am sorry to ask this—how can anyone reconcile the statement made by the honourable Senator Hugessen in 1945, 19 years ago, with the statement he made in this house last night?

Senator Thorvaldson last night quoted Senator Lambert. May I say here that Senator Lambert is another honourable senator for whom I have the greatest admiration, and he also supported, as far as anyone can judge from his remarks, a distinctive Canadian flag which contains something of the history of this country. I shall read what was said by him at that time, and I point out that this