

Senator Connolly (Ottawa West) commenced in his usual diplomatic style, and referred quite appropriately to the fine contributions to the building of Canada by Sir John A. Macdonald. He went on to pay a tribute to Sir Wilfrid Laurier—and I was happy to see that Senator O'Leary (Carleton) did the same. Then he referred to the contribution by Mr. Borden and of course to that distinguished luminary of this particular chamber, Mr. Meighen. He found even some kind words for Mr. Mackenzie King. I must say here that, as I listened to my friend Senator O'Leary, I felt he distinguished himself by his eloquence, he pitched his theme on a high note and, if I were back in the classroom today marking papers, as I have done in the university for some considerable time, I would give him "A plus" for eloquence. I would give him very high marks for making a contribution which was distinctive in its literary quality and which appeals to the emotions of Canadian people. I think it makes the Senate a better place for his having spoken.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Cameron: On the other hand, being a practical farmer from the west, I do not think I could give him high marks for his logic. I say that in all kindness, and I will come back to it later. The discussion so far, with this particular exception, has been the kind of thing we like to think the Senate of Canada stands for. I must say frankly to Senator O'Leary that I cannot support his amendment. I feel this is where some of his logic begins to fall apart.

We are discussing a matter on which in the other place there were some 280 speeches, and it is stretching the English language a long way to dignify some of them by calling them speeches. We have discussed this subject on the radio, we have discussed it on television, in the press, in our churches, we have discussed it wherever people meet. But there is by no means unanimity now, and there never will be unanimity on this particular topic.

No matter what length of time Senator O'Leary may be prepared to give the Senate, or a committee of the Senate, to bring in a new design, we could never achieve a greater measure of unanimity than we have today.

As I sense the pulse of the people of this country, and I have wide contacts, my feeling is that, at a very modest and conservative figure, 65 to 75 per cent of the Canadian people want a distinctive Canadian flag.

I was a little disappointed last night that many of my colleagues were not over in the other place, in the galleries, listening to the

discussion which took place—though it certainly was not the Canadian Parliament at its best. What impressed me most was that the galleries were packed. Who made up the majority of the people in the galleries? Young people, young Canadians, the future citizens of this country. I made it my business to move among them and to listen to them. I could be wrong but, as I sensed their expressions, there was a feeling that they, too, wanted a distinctive Canadian flag. They were not unhappy with the maple leaf flag; they might be quite happy with another design, but that is not the point.

In spite of the emotion which has been generated, particularly in the other place, on this issue, Canadians are not basically an emotional people. We are true to the traditions of all northern peoples. We find it hard to become excited and steamed up about any issue. I sometimes feel that it would be better if we were a little more emotional, and injected into our national life a little more colour and pageantry, both of which are associated with emotion.

Like many honourable senators, I have travelled in many parts of the world. One of the things which impressed me while driving through the countryside of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, was to see their national flag flying on every schoolhouse and public building, and frequently in the farmyards and over the farm gates. I like to see that sort of thing. It is colourful, has meaning and gives distinction to the people. In Canada we do not practice that to anything like the extent I would like to see. I hope that when we evolve and accept a new Canadian flag, we shall fly it in thousands, and thus inject a little more colour into the life of this nation.

A great deal has been said in the past about symbols. I listened to Senator O'Leary with interest when he spoke of the place of the shamrock, and as far as the Irish are concerned I agree with him. I think the only reason the Irish did not put the shamrock on their flag is that they never thought about it.

As one of Scottish descent, I might feel equally fervent about the thistle. In all frankness, as one whose family, like others, was deeply involved in World War II, particularly at sea, having had eleven relatives of one branch of the family perish at sea, under the Red Ensign, I must say that I would have been quite happy to go along with the Red Ensign. However, I know from my experience of the Canadian people that the great majority who came from other lands have no particular feeling about the Union Jack or the Red Ensign. It is not that they do not respect them, it is that they do not feel they