

ty, and we should have some concept of Canadianism that would differentiate us, say, from the United States and from other countries. We should be thinking along those lines. The Senate chamber represents not only the regions, but peoples of all kinds; it represents what has been done in the past and what should be done in the future. I do not think we have that kind of setup in the House of Commons. Here we have the provinces, we have the unity of the provinces, but we do not have the unity of the Canadian people or the Canadian nation. We should be thinking along those lines. When anyone comes into the Senate chamber and sees these windows, that should immediately lift them towards that unity, through their diversity, recognizing the diversity that we have. That brings to mind the mosaic idea that came out in the thirties when Mr. McGibbon wrote his book on *The Canadian Mosaic*. It dealt with the history that has been making Canada and it gives us an idea of the Canadian identity.

Mr. MacNeill: May I add one word there? We have neglected to work into that mosaic the original natives, the Indian and the Eskimo. We should try to do away with the idea that they were savages. The more I read about them, the more I think that they were even more civilized in some respects than the people who came here. We should think of them and make them part of this. I doubt whether Champlain or any of the other gentlemen could have got very far had it not been for the Indians and their canoes. Those Indians knew how to handle the canoes and how to live in the forests. We should think about them.

Senator Yuzyk: Some of those ideas do come from looking at our committee room 256-S. We depict some of the ideas there.

The Chairman: That is in the field of transportation and the basic industries, mainly. You are thinking of the broad aspect of it, of society.

Senator Yuzyk: That is right.

Mr. MacNeill: As far as the public is concerned, what they see is the Senate chamber. That is the shrine; that is where you have to focus attention.

Senator Yuzyk: The shrine of Canadian unity.

Mr. MacNeill: That is right. Why not?

The Chairman: The word "shrine" is a very good word to introduce into this discussion. I would like to introduce another word right here, though I wish Senator Carter were here because he objected to it mildly. He might agree with it now. The word is "symbol," the symbolism that must be embodied in this installation to reflect the ideas that are being expressed here this morning and that I hope will continue to be expressed as we continue to sit on this problem. We do this by creating a symbol, so that people can look at it, and so that those who are in the chamber can be motivated by it. It is fine to have symbolism, but I think you also have to have a spur, to encourage, to develop motivation towards the idea of national unity. If we can get that kind of abstract thought expressed in terms of stained glass, we may have achieved something worthwhile for many people for a very long time to come. There is a great opportunity here to do that.

Senator Yuzyk: May I ask what Senator Carter objected to?

The Chairman: He said he was not too much in favour of the idea of symbolic material being in the windows.

Perhaps one does not have to do that to achieve the idea of symbolism. I think the symbol can be something that is concrete. For example, one of the symbols of the early days, to which Mr. MacNeill refers, could very well be the canoe, or the tepee.

Mr. MacNeill: Or the Kayak.

The Chairman: Yes. That is very concrete, but it does become symbolic when it achieves the prominence we are thinking of. Senator Carter's remark was of a general kind, and I do not think he would object to the discussion we are having now.

Senator Beaubien: Mr. Chairman, should we not have a motion, that we agree that we should install some kind of windows in the Senate? Is that the feeling of the committee? Then we could, in time, decide what kind of motif. But are we here to decide that we can put windows in?

The Chairman: I think we are here to decide whether we will recommend that to the Senate.

Senator Beaubien: I so move, then.

The Chairman: I think we are to decide, first of all, an installation, and I would assume that the very fact that the committee is established and that senators have agreed to sit on it is evidence enough of our interest in saying whether this installation is possible and, secondly, that it meets certain standards. At the moment, I do not think we need a motion to proceed with the project. In the end, we would be making a recommendation which would call for proceeding with the project at a particular time. As a matter of fact, I think we have a motion.

Mr. Fortier: The terms of reference say:

To consider and report upon the question of the installation of stained glass windows . . .

The Chairman: At the end of our deliberations, if we decide we do not want to go ahead with this, we shall so recommend to the Senate. I do not think we need a specific motion at this time.

Senator Beaubien: Very well, I withdraw it.

The Chairman: Mr. MacNeill, would you like to talk about the decor of the chamber? I know you are not an expert in decor, but neither are those who are going to work there, nor are those who are going to come in and visit it. The decor is important. Since you have not any administrative responsibility here any more, would you like to talk about the chamber as a place—and perhaps not only the chamber itself but the surroundings, the immediate precincts of the chamber, such as the lobby and the antechamber, as a place worthy of the Parliament and the people of Canada.

Mr. MacNeill: I have not thought too much about that. There is the question of the pictures in the Senate. I do not know who of you were here when they were discussed. You were here, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. MacNeill: Perhaps some of you recall the discussions concerning the pictures on the sides of the chamber.

The Chairman: I think everyone here has been involved in such discussions, Mr. MacNeill.