

should possess a distinctive national flag. You will be asked to appoint a select committee of members of both Houses of Parliament to consider a suitable design for a Canadian flag.

Now what is a national flag? Surely it is a symbol of nationhood; it is the outward and visible sign of all those feelings, traditions, hopes and aspirations, which go to make up a nation. I feel that it will be an excellent thing for us to have in this country a symbol to which we can all look up in that way. Now I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am proud of the Union Jack.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: It gives me a thrill to see it flutter in the breeze. It has served us well during the formative period of our country. We have been happy to live under it, and we have enjoyed its protection. We know what it means as the flag of a great and proud nation, the British people, who have rendered great service to the world—great and distinguished service—and not greater at any time than during the past six years.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: What is the matter with it now?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: The fact remains that it is the flag of Great Britain. It has no particular designation to show that it has any special connection with Canada; 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.

We are to have a joint parliamentary committee to consider the design and to make a report. 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. None of our people would have it otherwise. By so doing it will give evidence of our membership in the British family of nations, and will be an indication of the natural origin of about one-half of our people, who trace their ancestry from the British Isles. 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. May I remind honourable senators that our citizens in whose veins flows the blood of France are the descendants of those who first settled in this land; and it is they who have a better title, or at any rate an older title than any of the rest of us, to call themselves Canadians.

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. That might be difficult of attainment in view of the three prerequisites which I have just mentioned; but, to the extent possible, I believe that our flag should be simple in design and not too intricate in pattern. A national flag, after all, should be clear and plain for all the world to see. It would be a mistake, I think, to try to put too much or represent too much in our national flag. No doubt the matter will be gone into with great thoroughness by the joint parliamentary committee, and after their investigation I am sure they will achieve a satisfactory result.

Now on the question of Canadian citizenship, the gracious Speech from the Throne has this to say:

The Government also considers that it is advisable to revise and clarify the definition of Canadian citizenship, and to bring the legislation respecting national status, naturalization and immigration into conformity with the definition of citizenship. You will be asked to approve the required measures.

The measures have not yet been brought down, and therefore we have no details of them. However, generally speaking, I should like to say that I welcome any steps which will place more emphasis on our present status and less on our racial antecedents. I think that in the past in this country there has been too great a tendency to classify ourselves according to racial origins, which in many cases were so remote as to lose all possible meaning. How, for instance, can you designate as an English-Canadian a man whose family has lived in this country for the past four or five generations, and who has in his racial strain not only English, but perhaps part Irish, Dutch and German blood? How can you classify as a French-Canadian a man whose ancestors have been in this country for three hundred years, and who, very likely has, as so many have, Scotch and other bloods intermingled with his French blood? It seems to me that a man of that kind would have a right to call himself a Canadian, pure and simple, without any reference to his ancestral origin.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: People in this country are too prone to classify themselves, and to allow their government to classify them, as English-Canadians, French-Can-