

eloquent presentation of his point of view in relation to the future of this flag.

I think that when one has considered all that has been said in both houses so far, one realizes that if there is any point of contention at all, it boils down to whether or not this is a distinctive Canadian flag—whether or not it may or may not be an ideal design, reflecting fully and adequately the aspirations of the present Canadian people, or expressing the potential measurement of future generations in connection with the insignia that we call the Canadian flag, representing us at home and elsewhere in the world. Time alone will reveal its true significance. But what is really being expressed here today is not the be-all and end-all of the great desire for national identity. The crystallization of sentiment in metaphorical form, whether it be in verse or musical measures or physical guise, is the process which must be subject to the profound and subtle influences of evolutionary advancement in the life of this still young country.

It may be said with much truth that great national symbols are born, not made. The Union Jack itself in its final form has been the by-product of the gradual processes of evolution. The Stars and Stripes was born of the deep and simple devotion of an unknown woman whose attachment to her native soil was the source of her inspiration. It is worth noting that for a period following the secession of the thirteen colonies and the Declaration of Independence, the Union Jack continued to adorn the upper left-hand corner of the first version of the Stars and Stripes, and the respect for their British background in the old dominion of Virginia is still manifested in the flying of the Union Jack over the replica of the old Government House in Williamsburg, which with so many other structures now memorializes the pre-revolutionary days in that state.

It surely suggests, in that respect alone, a gratifying recognition of the common historic origins with so much that is cherished in the history of Canada as well.

And so I submit that out of this declaration which is contained in the resolution before us today we can develop even larger conceptions than are expressed in this initial effort to proclaim the note of nationhood. Particularly will this come to pass if through school and church, and the parliamentary councils of the nation, the vital attachment of the people to the soil of Canada receives due emphasis and attention. Let the positive and not the negative note be emphasized at this time for the future of this historic venture.

Let us also remember the spectacular increase in the population of Canada since the end of the last war, consisting mainly of largely diverse peoples and races in this new land to which they have come from countries and continents in other parts of the world, and whose regard for the adoption of a new Canadian flag by the representative action of those who represent them in Parliament will do much, in my opinion, to enhance the bright future that Canada will have in its aspirations towards nationhood.

The gratifying background of the whole thing is that we have today in Canada, I think, in contrast even with the point of view expressed in 1945 and 1946, when I was chairman of the joint committee, that it is undeniably reflected in the viewpoint of the younger generation which has matured and increased in numbers since that time. I feel through my own family, which has grown up during those years, that there is only one point of view, and it is to have definite recognition in the world where we have made the pretension, at any rate, of having some determining voice in its future affairs.

**Hon. Clement A. O'Leary:** Honourable senators, before I proceed with the main text of my brief remarks I should like to refer to the fact that today before the Orders of the Day were called I asked that a correction be made in the report of the *Debates of the Senate* of December 15, I was referring to an interjection that was incorrectly attributed to me. However, I did make an interjection which is correctly reported as:

That is not correct.

That was when I advised Senator Pouliot that his statement was not correct.

Since that time I have apologized personally to Senator Pouliot for the rudeness of this interruption, but I did not apologize for the substance of my challenge.

Senator Pouliot said, in part:

The leaders of the Legion—

And I presume he was speaking of the leaders of the Royal Canadian Legion.

—do not represent the sentiments of the members of the rank and file of the army, navy and air force, any more than the leaders of labour unions represent the feelings of the members of their unions.

To my mind, this was a general and rather sweeping statement of condemnation of the Royal Canadian Legion. That is the way I interpreted it. It was a condemnation of the effective democracy of that organization. I want to say simply—and I think I have a