

He can go with you"—meaning me. So I walked with Mr. Lapointe to the building on Wellington Street.

On the way down the minister said, "I do not know what we will put on that building, or what we will call it. There is this question of language—we have two languages, and so on." So one thing led to another, and I said, "There is one thing you can always do, and that is put a Latin inscription on it. No one will know what it means, anyway, and there will be no difficulty about languages." He said, "That is a good idea." We laughed about this, and went on down to the building. As we came towards it, we saw that there was a big piece of stone above the doorway. He stopped and said, "I have it. One word: "Justice. A Roman will understand it; a Frenchman will understand it; and an Englishman will understand it. Everybody will understand it." If you go down there today you will see the word "Justice" above the entrance.

Then we walked upstairs to the third floor, where they had set up a very nice place for the policemen. As the minister went in there he looked up and he said, "Well, the minister's chair would be over there". I said, "Yes." Right above the spot he was referring to was a plaster space, and he said, "We will put a figure of Justice holding the scale of justice over there, so when the Minister of Justice comes in here in the morning, the first thing he will see is "Justice". Perhaps he will think, "That is what I am here for. It may do some good. It may help people coming into the building to know that we are not here as policemen, but that we are here to administer justice." I thought that was a pretty good idea.

I do not know whether or not we can use one word to do that job in the Senate chamber. I see that they are having a meeting at the Conference Centre.

Senator Quart: A battle!

Mr. MacNeill: They have had them for years. I used to attend them in one capacity or another. I was telling Mr. Fortier this morning that I had the good fortune, or otherwise, to be appointed secretary to the attorney generals' conference after I had come up here as the Law Clerk of the Senate. It happened this way. It was not that I was qualified for the job, but they did not know of anybody else, and they phoned me and said, "Will you take this on?" I said, "No. I do not want to take this now. I am out of the Civil Service." They said, "Well, that is the reason we want you. We do not want anybody in the Civil Service. The attorneys general of the provinces are going to make the appointment. We are down here at the Chateau, and we thought of you. Will you take the job?" I said, "No, not on your life." Well, eventually I received a delegation including the deputy attorney general of Ontario. They came up and said, "Come on, now." So I weakened and I became the secretary. So when I went down to this meeting, Mr. Garson was the chairman. On his right was the attorney general of Ontario, and I sat on his left. Next to me was Mr. Maurice Duplessis, a man I knew very well, because I had quite a lot to do with him during the early part of the war. Well, we were sitting there listening to the usual rigmarole of all the various people talking about their own part of the country, and so on, and Mr. Duplessis said to me, "You know, this is rather a boring proceeding. The first thing you do when you come to one of these conferences is to get all the old files out, read up all the old rows and the old prejudices, and then parade them anew. After you get through with that you go *in camera* and you really start the work. It is too bad we could not live *in camera* for this kind of thing, instead of in the public eye." You know, I think

that sometimes he was a wise man. The more you discuss your differences in public, the less opportunity you have for coming to a reasonable conclusion. That is just my opinion, but I agreed with Duplessis on that.

As I was thinking about that conference I thought, "It is too bad that when we come together we cannot think, not of what divides us, but of what unites us." Then it occurred to me—perhaps Miss Milne might like to give her opinion on this—that if we wanted one word, that word should be "Unity".

Senator Quart: "Unity". That is translatable both ways, too.

Senator Yuzyk: "Unity in diversity."

Mr. MacNeill: I do not want your "diversity"; I like "unity." I would like to see people in this country drop diversity and say, "We are Canadians." I do not think we are going to make a great country out of Canada, or a country in which everybody, diverse or not, can live, unless we are Canadians first, last and always. We have all the diversity we need now. Let us concentrate first on unity, and have something there that will make people think of unity, especially the young people, so that they will think, "What can I do to further this? What can I do to make a better Canada?"

If we do that, I think we will have contributed something to this country, and we will have something that everybody, including our children and our grandchildren, can be proud of.

The Chairman: Mr. MacNeill, I think you have helped us a great deal this morning. This is just the kind of discussion that I think the committee needs to launch itself into, while trying to come up with a recommendation. I am sure that there are a lot of questions that people on the committee have. Certainly I have a lot that I would like to get some opinions from you on. Would anybody like to start?

Senator Yuzyk: I will start on this question of unity, because I am for it, though I cannot see how we can run away from diversity. What does the United States say? "*E pluribus unum*"?

The Chairman: Yes.

Senator Yuzyk: The unity aspect, I think, is very important, but we cannot run away from diversity, because that is what we have.

Mr. MacNeill: We have never even tried it; we have always been diverse.

Senator Yuzyk: That is why I stated "Unity in diversity". It is to recognize the fact that what we have here in Canada is diversity, though we should stress above all the factor of unity. It is not always so easy to convey, because as you know, totalitarian countries express unity, and we do not quite agree with their type of unity.

Miss Milne: It is destructive unity.

Senator Yuzyk: I would just like to give some ideas on the Canadian identity. We have been thinking of multiculturalism; we have been talking about citizenship and brotherhood. These are factors that we should try to bring in in some way. I know it is not very easy, but I think it can be done, because since the B and B commission we have been thinking a great deal about the Canadian identity.