

I know, even as you do, that there is a certain division among our people as to just what they do want. I think that is a normal reaction. I freely admit that I could not have designed a flag, nor, I suspect—though I have listened to a few suggestions here—could many of my honourable colleagues—certainly, not one which would have satisfied all the people. It would not have satisfied all the people any more than the Government of the day satisfied everyone when they designated the Red Ensign many years ago.

I like the Red Ensign; I think it is a beautiful flag but I do not think, and never have thought, that it should be Canada's national flag; nor, for that matter, any variation or incorporation of it.

It has been said that we cannot or should not forget the past, and I agree that we should not. This country was brought to nationhood by men and women of courage and imagination. They founded a new country in which to live and, in many cases, prosper. The two great founding races were later joined by people from other countries and they, in my opinion, showed equally as much courage as did those who came originally. It has been said in this chamber that only 40 per cent of Canadians can claim an Anglo-Saxon background, 34 per cent are of French origin, while the balance, 26 per cent, came from other ethnic groups. If these figures are correct, they are a truly representative gathering from far and near; and I hope they are all proud of the fact that their ancestors came here and that they are all now Canadians.

I come from an English and Scottish background. My ancestors came to Prince Edward Island three or four generations ago but, to my mother's disgust, I am afraid, I place very little emphasis on that fact. It is enough for me to say I am a Canadian. I was born in this country and when my time comes I hope to die here. I am proud of Canada, as all of you are, but I think a lot of people are placing too much emphasis on where their ancestors came from. That is the point I wish to make.

I have mentioned all this in order to develop the thought that it is necessary to be truly Canadian in our approach to this problem. It might be argued that a flag, to be truly Canadian, should have a conglomeration of symbols, if we were to recognize the background of all our peoples. Why single out only two, as has been suggested by many speakers in the past few months?

Senator O'Leary (Carleton) was at his most eloquent best the other day. He always is when he speaks of Ireland. He brought out the fact that Ireland did not put the shamrock on their flag; but neither, I would like to add, did they use the Union Jack. France

has not used the fleur-de-lis, and other countries no doubt have failed to use their symbols as national emblems. But they were not faced with the problem we are faced with today. The Irish are all Irishmen together in one small island—true, it is a little divided at times, but it is all one island. The French are all of a common background in France; the Italians in Italy, the Greeks in Greece, the Turks in Turkey. Oh, I could go on and on ad infinitum, but none of them have had the problem we as Canadians face—a nation of many racial origins, as I mentioned earlier; a nation almost equally divided into three main groups and subdivided into many more, but all united as Canadians. As Senator Cameron said the other day, "We are rich in the heritage of other lands."

On Tuesday last Senator Connolly (Ottawa West), in one of the best speeches I have ever heard him deliver, drew a picture of the growth of our country. He brought us along most eloquently through the pages of our history, from our birth to the present day. It was what I might term a moderate presentation, so typical of the man himself, and he left a message that we would all do well to remember. As a comparatively new member of this chamber, I am happy to see that the same degree of moderation has been shown by most of us during our deliberations.

Speaking in this vein, and assuming it would be a virtual impossibility to please all our people about a design for a new flag, I have asked myself, what is wrong with a flag that has as its motif a maple leaf? What design could have been chosen which would have served to cause less dissension? Quite frankly, I failed to come up with any better solution. Like others in this chamber, I have received many letters dealing with this issue. Those who favoured a new flag have the maple leaf as part of some design or other; others retained the Union Jack in an equal number of designs; while yet a few were adamant that it would be sacrilegious not to retain the Red Ensign.

One gentleman, I might add, an old shipmate of mine, went so far as to say I could not turn away from the old "Red Duster" because I had served under it for so long at sea. I was interested to hear Senator Croll refer to it as the "Red Duster" in his speech. I asked him today about that, and he said the expression was used by the Imperial army in the last war. I did not point this out in my reply to him, but I could have said, "That is one of the main reasons why I favour a new flag."

In fact, I sailed the oceans of the world under the Red Ensign, as we know it in Canada, and we had constantly to point out that it was the Canadian flag, not the more familiar Red Ensign of the British merchant