

508 and 509 is imperative, as is the departure of all foreign forces from Lebanon. The Lebanese must be allowed to get on with the immense task of reconciliation and reconstruction.

Bearing today's date, another message from the Secretary of State for External Affairs has been received by me.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs says that our ambassador to Israel called on the Deputy Secretary General of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs today to protest the most recent bombing of the official residence and the lack of response to our previous protest.

Mr. Bar-On conveyed the Israeli government's deepest regret for the damage to the residence and said that everything would be done to try to avoid a future similar situation, but that it was not possible to give assurances that such damage would not recur.

With respect to searches of the ambassador's car between East and West Beirut, Mr. Bar-On conveyed official regrets and apologies for any harassment suffered. Instructions have been issued to the IDF to stop these searches.

Senator Haidasz: Honourable senators, may I ask a supplementary question? Is the Leader of the Government in a position this afternoon to comment on a press report that the Canadian government has forbidden our ambassador in West Beirut to carry on any talks with representatives of the Palestinian people?

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, the question will be taken as notice. I have not been advised of that fact by the minister.

[English]

HON. HARTLAND DE M. MOLSON
HON. DONALD CAMERON
HON. DAVID A. CROLL
HON. FRED A. McGRAND
HON. F. ELSIE INMAN

FELICITATIONS ON TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF
APPOINTMENT TO SENATE

Hon. Daniel A. Lang: Honourable senators, I rise on a question of privilege. I should like to remind you that on this day 27 years ago my aging colleague to my right was summoned to the Senate.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Lang: Along with him, twelve others were summoned to the Senate on that day, including my young friend, Senator McGrand, as well as Senators Inman, Cameron and Croll.

I hope that the initiative the Prime Minister of that day took in causing to be inducted into this chamber such a large group of talented people, will be emulated by the present Prime Minister.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

[Senator Perrault.]

HOLIDAYS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday the debate on the motion of Senator Bird for the second reading of Bill C-201, to amend the Holidays Act.

Hon. Henry D. Hicks: Honourable senators, I have never received as much correspondence in respect of a single piece of legislation as I have relating to Bill C-201. In my case, without exception, all those who have written to me are in favour of retaining the term "Dominion Day".

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Hicks: That, however, is not the reason why I oppose this bill, as I shall explain in the remarks I wish to make this afternoon.

I should say, though, that my correspondence contains some rather interesting observations. One distinguished Canadian—a resident of the city of Ottawa, as a matter of fact—is reluctant to see the ancient term "Dominion" dropped. He states:

I know of no other country which has such an inferiority complex that it has to use its own name to denote a national holiday.

Well, honourable senators, we learned from Senator Bird that Australia calls its national holiday "Australia Day."

● (1450)

What about this term "dominion"? In his speech of last evening, Senator Macquarrie recounted how the word was chosen. According to his account, Sir Leonard Tilley was the one who picked the word "dominion" out of the eighth verse of Psalm 72, which reads:

He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.

My recollection is, and my correspondent says the same thing, that it was a Nova Scotian, Sir Charles Tupper, who chose the word, but that is a small point and we need not quarrel about it.

In any event, one of the Fathers of Confederation picked this word. It was in no wise a word established by the British to denote any inferior state or description of a country. The fact that Canada chose it had nothing to do with the British Parliament or the British government. The fact that other portions of the Commonwealth chose to use the same term—Australia, New Zealand and South Africa come to mind at once—meant they were copying a Canadian idea and not a British, or imperial, or Commonwealth idea. The word "dominion" was a Canadian idea taken from Psalm 72.

I think that traditions are valuable and that we ought not to turn our backs on our heritage. Indeed, we should build our future on our understanding of the great accomplishments and the great episodes of the past. I am disturbed that all too often today we Canadians are turning our backs on our heritage and avoiding reference to those great episodes that made us the great nation we are. We have practically eradicated the word "royal" from all references to any of the activities or agencies

in our country. It may very well be that our French Canadian friends thought that the royal epithet referred too specifically to the British monarchy—as, indeed, it did—and I have gone along with that, although with some reluctance, because it seems to me that an appreciation of the past is necessary to an understanding of the present and to a preparation for the future.

A week ago I received a message from the Honourable Jean-Jacques Blais stating:

On the occasion of the official ceremony of the Patriation of the Canadian Constitution you received a commemorative nickel dollar packaged in a red velvet case.

This brilliant uncirculated coin will be offered to the Royal Canadian Mint's clients from September 1 to November 30, 1982. It will be presented in a similar case bearing a maple leaf instead of the armories of Canada.

Is this the beginning now of dropping the arms of Canada? I hope not. I say again that when we turn our backs on history, we lose something which can never be regained. I hope that we will not do that.

In view of the arguments that were put forward so well by Senator Macquarrie last evening, it is not necessary for me to say much more. In my opinion, the term "dominion" in no way connotes subservience. It relates to our past and refers to the activities of our Fathers of Confederation. There is no reason why we ought not to perpetuate Dominion Day.

I shall be content to close this brief intervention by quoting another great Nova Scotian. These words, by the way, were last voiced in the Senate by the late Senator Grattan O'Leary. In one of his last speeches here he quoted Joseph Howe as follows:

A wise nation preserves its records, gathers up its mementos, decorates the tombs of its illustrious dead, repairs its great public structures, and fosters national pride and love of country, by perpetual reference to the sacrifices and glories of the past.

Hon. H. Carl Goldenberg: Honourable senators, would Senator Hicks permit a question?

Senator Hicks: Certainly.

Senator Goldenberg: Did I understand Senator Hicks to say that Canada adopted the term "dominion", and so did Australia, New Zealand and South Africa?

Senator Hicks: It is my impression that Canada adopted it first, and then the other colonies when they became self-governing, used it. I do not know what exact technique or discussions were involved.

● (1455)

Senator Goldenberg: Is it not a fact that Australia never used the term "dominion"? It was, from the beginning, and still is, the Commonwealth of Australia, and that is set out in the Australian Constitution.

Senator Hicks: I certainly have to bow to Senator Goldenberg's more precise knowledge. Perhaps I was loosely referring

to the fact that, for many years, Australia was included in the general reference to the "dominions" within the Commonwealth. However, I am sure he is technically correct.

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Are they not described in the Statute of Westminster by the generic term "dominions," and then specified by their peculiar titles?

Senator Goldenberg: That is correct so far as the Statute of Westminster is concerned, but the title of Australia has always been and still is "the Commonwealth of Australia," not "the Dominion of Australia."

Senator Roblin: There is no argument about that.

Hon. Hartland de M. Molson: Honourable senators, I have listened to the excellent speeches that have been made in this debate, and it is quite apparent that there are great differences, largely emotional, on this issue, as there were in the debate on the Constitution.

Senator Hicks, who has just finished speaking has, I am afraid, said much of what I will be saying.

I am concerned that Bill C-201 is just another very small step in the process, which has been continued over the last few years, of downgrading tradition and obscuring our heritage. Some of these steps have taken the form of removing the word "royal" from the mail and from the armed forces such as the former Royal Canadian Navy, Royal Canadian Armoured Corps, and the Royal Canadian Air Force in which I was so proud to serve between 1939 and 1945.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Molson: If anyone doubts the public interest in and support for the traditional appearance, at least, of the armed forces, let him only look at the lawn in front of this building between 10.00 and 10.30 every morning. He will find that the Changing of the Guard draws an audience that would compare not too badly in number with that drawn by the Expos, and certainly by the Argos.

The Constitution debate did as much to divide the country, in my opinion, as anything that has occurred since Confederation. It looks as though this bill to amend the Holidays Act will have the effect of keeping that pot boiling. It puzzles and bothers me. The government emphasizes unity, yet it seems it almost favours measures which divide us. I cannot believe it is intentional but, if one can be objective, it looks that way.

Whether the national holiday should be called "Canada Day" or "Dominion Day" is a decision that should be taken by the people of Canada and, particularly, by their representatives in Parliament. A decision on such a matter as this, affecting widespread emotions, should never be sneaked through by way of a questionable bill or motion.

The main, and difficult, problem with "Dominion Day" is that it does not translate into French, and the French perception of it is one of subservience or dominion by others. Senator Robichaud mentioned that, to him, it meant dominion by others. However, to me, and I think to many, "dominion" was chosen on a triumphal note to signal the escape from colonial

status to one where the people of this new country had domination over their own land, laws and customs. To me, it mirrors the American choice of "Independence Day" as the name of their national holiday.

If the people of Canada want to call it "Canada Day," I am perfectly content to accept that. If they do not, I also accept that fact. What I cannot accept is a bill coming to us for the sober second thought for which the Senate was created, having gone through the other place without any debate and perhaps without even a quorum. This private bill now becomes a public bill because of its passage in the other place. Therefore, it is government-sponsored and, as usual, we will see the whips put on to avoid what, to this government, seems to be the most important thing to avoid—loss of face.

● (1500)

Honourable senators, as the situation stands, I cannot vote for this bill. I would like to repeat and emphasize, however, that if a bill comes forward in the normal way, if it is considered by a majority of the members of Parliament and is favoured by both houses, and if the public has the chance to express itself, I will quite happily support it. The present effort is quite unworthy both of this house and of the government of the day.

Hon. Jack Marshall: Honourable senators, I am glad to follow two such distinguished senators. In his speech last evening, Senator Macquarrie indicated that he was not going to refer to the incident in the other place—but I am going to.

Honourable senators, we have had many opportunities to carry out our responsibilities in this chamber in accordance with what the Fathers of Confederation envisaged to be our duties. Having looked through the *Debates* of the other place, it is evident that, some 35 years ago, the Senate did stop the passage of a similar bill to change the name "Dominion Day" to "Canada Day." It was moved by Mr. Côté from the riding of Matapédia-Matane. I give full marks to the honourable senators of that day who stopped the passage of that bill.

Honourable senators, I will not repeat the various incidents that gave rise to the opportunities for senators to stop legislation which was not in the best interests of Canadians of all regions of the country. As well, without reminding honourable senators of the number of times we have merely "rubber stamped" such legislation against our consciences, I will say that we now have an opportunity to stand up against a bill—be it private, public or whatever—a piece of legislation that will only fester the "sores" that are spreading throughout this Parliament and across the country.

Bill C-201 we do not need, honourable senators, and I appeal to every senator in this chamber to show his independence so that, once and for all, we can stop what can only be referred to as a mischievous act perpetrated by a dozen members of Parliament. These members have proven their lack of patriotism, certainly as evidenced by the fact that they knew what they were doing, by a lack of courtesy toward their colleagues in not giving them the opportunity to speak, and by

[Senator Molson.]

their seemingly hypocritical attitude towards their oath of office and towards the wishes of their constituents.

Let me say, honourable senators, that I am aware that the passage of Bill C-201 was carried out in a manner which was technically correct. The Speaker in the other place, in not allowing any members to protest, was carrying out a procedure which, although technically right, was certainly not morally right. In fact, the entire exercise was not carried out in the Canadian way.

I ask honourable senators this question: Is it the Canadian way for a member who was present in the house at the time—who did not even know what he was voting for, much less what the house was voting on—to agree to the passage of the particular phase of the bill in question?

The mover of the bill, back in 1980, made a speech in which he referred to having written to the Secretary of State, the Honourable Francis Fox, about a bill that had been brought forward at that time. He said that the exercise was an example of the power of a very small minority that was strong enough to block the passage of legislation that could obtain all-party support and thus pass the house vote with an overwhelming majority. At that time he complained about the fact that half a dozen Conservative MPs who were vehemently opposed to the change could stop the bill. Honourable senators, that is what is called "the pot calling the kettle black." The honourable gentleman was against such a practice in 1980, yet, strangely enough, he was not against this practice, whereby 12 members of Parliament were able to pass a bill which so affects this country.

Again I ask honourable senators: Was it the Canadian way to use the authority to place the house into committee of the whole, with only 12 members present and not one question having been asked of anyone? Was it the Canadian way to agree to all clauses of the bill, to report back to the house, to read the bill a third time and to pass it, all of which took place in five minutes?

Honourable senators, bearing in mind everything that has gone on in the other place with respect to parliamentary reform, surely this is a perfect example of where that reform is needed. If 12 members of Parliament can collaborate and, in five minutes, can change the course of our history, seemingly untouched by their consciences and lacking knowledge of the feelings of the majority of Canadians they represent, then I suggest that honourable senators put a stop to this hypocrisy. I think that it is easy to recognize which end of the Parliament Buildings ought to undergo reform.

Honourable senators, I have no objection to a private member's recommending a change by whatever method he deems fit. That is his right as a Canadian member of Parliament. The method used in this case to get the passage of a bill through the other place, however, is one to which I object most strenuously. It can and should be stopped in this chamber. Surely there must be a sufficient number of us here who recognize that we can, as is our duty, send the bill back to the House and ask for a government bill to be presented in a

straightforward and decent, democratic way. Let the critics have their say. This bill should be allowed a debate in the other place, whereupon it should be sent back here to be put through the same process. Let us not allow ourselves to be put in the position where we permit less than 3 per cent of the parliamentarians to collaborate in a plan to undermine and alter the traditions that used to make us the envy of the world.

Honourable senators, this is another attempt to undo the past, to rewrite history, to revoke and revise the few traditions we have left. Most importantly, however, it allows Canada to be changed without the consent of the people of this country. I ask honourable senators this question: What harm would we be doing to anyone by doing what is right?

Perhaps, honourable senators, a majority of Canadians do want our Holiday Act amended to change the name from "Dominion Day" to "Canada Day." Why do it, however, in a manner that further embitters our citizens? As Senator Hicks has done, I will read from only two of the many letters I have received on this issue. A lady from Waterloo, Ontario, wrote:

I would simply like to urge, in the strongest terms, that the Senate give serious consideration to the cogent arguments for the retention of the present name. It is my feeling that Canadians have been seriously shortchanged and the historical and spiritual traditions of our country eroded by the swift passage in the Commons last week of the private member's bill to alter the name.

A man from Scarborough, Ontario, wrote:

Dominion Day is a part of the great historical heritage of this nation, taken as it is from Psalm 72:

He shall have dominion also from sea to sea.

The new Constitution has enshrined the term "Dominion" in the Constitution Act, 1867, section 3:

—the provinces . . . shall form and be one Dominion—

We are celebrating on July 1 the commemoration of Confederation and, thus, our independence. "Dominion" in no sense of the word is "colonial." Canada existed long before 1867, and the term "Canada Day" is surely neither meaningful of the present or future.

Honourable senators, with the greatest respect for Senator Bird, who opened the debate, I must disagree with her. In her speech she made mention of something that is very close to me—the Canadian soldiers who fought overseas. She said that they wore flashes bearing the name "Canada", and I do not disagree with that. She failed to recognize, however, that a lot of the soldiers and servicemen also wore their provincial flashes. The North Shore, New Brunswick Regiment, for example, wore a badge which had "Canada" on it as well, as did the North Nova Scotia Regiment. I would like to remind honourable senators of the pledge that all members of the Canadian forces took, many of whom died overseas. Our servicemen still take the same pledge, which is:

I . . . do swear that I will be faithful and bear true Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors according to law, so help me God.

There is no reference to "Canada" in that pledge, which is, as I understand it, taken from the British North America Act.

What about the veterans who came back? What about the one million veterans who are the ones we should still look to for the reasons why Canada is such a great nation? What do they do across the country in their Legion branches? What are the words of the ritual they use every time they meet? The ritual goes like this:

● (1510)

Before we proceed to the consideration of the business which has brought us together, let us pause for a few moments to think reverently of those of our comrades who by sea, by land and in the air, laid down their lives for their Sovereign and country . . .

Honourable senators, that same Canadian Legion, when they write to me, do so in letters headed, "The Royal Canadian Legion". Most of the letters are written by the Dominion President or the Dominion Secretary. This is on their letterhead, which they are proud of. I am not going to say that there are Legionnaires who do not want Canada Day, but this is the sort of thing we should be looking at.

I was reading a letter I received from the Dominion Chairman of the Monarchist League of Canada. On the letterhead is also mentioned the Dominion Secretary. As a matter of fact, they were asking me for my dues, which I was late in paying, but here is what they said about the monarchy. They reminded me that:

Monarchy prevents the growth of power by denying ultimate power to any politician;

Monarchy assures that our freedoms and liberties depend upon an institution above politics, which endures above the partisan battles and controversies which may divide Canada;

Monarchy enables men to oppose the government's policies without being accused of disloyalty to the state, as it maintains separation between head of state and head of government;

Monarchy exemplifies the family life, which must be at the base of any stable society;

Monarchy stands for the moral order of the country, which endures whatever the trends of the day.

Honourable senators, many editorials have been written in connection with this matter, but I am not going to talk about the editorials in the famous national papers; instead I am going to go right to the far corners of little Newfoundland. For instance, I am sure that nobody has ever heard of *The Coaster*. This is published in a little town about 350 miles up on the northern tip of the peninsula. This deals with Canada becoming 115 years old, and points out that even though they were all in favour of Canada, and talk about how wonderful things were in Newfoundland after Confederation, they say that we should never forget something that happens every year in Newfoundland on July 1.

However, we must not allow the birthday celebrations to erase the memory of the Battle of Beaumont Hamel on July 1, 1916, during the First World War, when the Royal Newfoundland Regiment was decimated and the cream of this province's youth were killed. That disaster did not stop others from promptly filling their places, many of whom also paid the supreme sacrifice. It was the willingness of these heroic men to fight for what we today call democracy, that makes it possible for us to celebrate our freedom and our greatness as a nation.

Another editorial is from the southern part of Newfoundland, and is from a newspaper called *The Gulf News*. They finish their editorial by saying:

Canada is like a huge body. The Utopian concept would see us aiding each other and observing some sort of balance arrangement for the good of the nation.

They are discussing the fact that Canada was spending \$5 million on celebrating Canada Day.

Instead some portions are shovelling the benefits in while others are starving and struggling to get to where there is full and plenty. This has been ongoing for some time and now the bloated areas are beginning to throw up the wastage. The five million spent July 1 is little more than a giant Rolaid. The situation persists.

"Ottawa: any millions of dollars or even thousands you have available for spending or wasting, please advise a community on the southwest tip of Newfoundland named Channel-Port aux Basques. When our problems are taken care of and this nation is on an even footing then there is time for celebration."

I have wondered over the years, honourable senators, and wonder now, what the changes that are today going on in our country are really destined to accomplish for the citizens of Canada. Was the country in such a mess prior to 1965 that we had to fight about a distinctive flag? We only have to ask ourselves what has happened to Canada in the intervening 17 years. Why did we have to rush into achieving a Canadian Constitution that further divided the country? Is Canada now better off? Are Canadians better off today? Are the poor any more capable of finding enough food or shelter or housing? Are the one and a quarter million Canadians who are out of work any surer of getting jobs? Can the youth of our country get a start in life? Can they begin a career and have a future? Is there unity among the provinces and in federal-provincial relations? Are Canadians happier than they were before we patriated the Constitution? Do the people love their government more? Is it not rather true that we are in a worse mess now than we ever were, with a government that is so blind to the realities of life that they are trying to bribe the citizens of Canada?

I say, if you want to have a Canada Day, have it. Have a Canada week. Have a Canada Month. Canada, however, is not a day, or a week or a month; it is 365 days a year of Canadians living together, it is hoped with leadership from a government that thinks of its people. But you cannot ram something down

[Senator Marshall.]

the throats of Canadians because you think it is best for them. You cannot bully people into doing something against their will, and you cannot bribe people with Canadian flags and balloons and pins, and money besides, because what is going to happen is what happened out in Belle Plaine, Saskatchewan, where a group returned a cheque for \$1,250, with the words, "We don't want your money or trinkets. We want leadership."

No, honourable senators, you do not create unity by using methods that are underhanded. People are too smart. You do not legislate unity, in a country of 23 million people, by 12 members of Parliament sneaking through a bill without caring about the consequences. Canadian unity comes from the hearts of individual Canadians who care about their country, and they will celebrate it in their own way, without interference from those they have lost confidence in.

Finally, if you want to have a Canada Day, have it, but do it, I repeat, in the Canadian way, through the acceptable rules laid down by the Fathers of Confederation, who created the Dominion of Canada, which is good enough for me.

Hon. Douglas D. Everett: Honourable senators, I should like to intervene very briefly in this debate. One of my reasons for intervening now is that my preference is that the matter be debated this afternoon and voted on, since I think that this is an issue that should be dealt with while we are all here, not with the idea of restricting debate, but with the idea of debating the matter now and bringing it to a vote as soon as everyone has had his say.

I want to speak principally because of the three speeches that were made today. There were aspects of those speeches that interested me very greatly.

Personally, I do not care whether we call this national holiday "Canada Day" or "Dominion Day." Perhaps I should care, but I just cannot find myself moved by the arguments on either side, although they have been, indeed, eloquent.

What I am concerned about, honourable senators, is the way in which this is being done. Senator Marshall and Senator Molson raised a very valid point, that here is an issue that deeply interests a great many Canadians, who have not had the opportunity to state their concerns, to debate the issue, or to appear before a parliamentary committee and make their input part of a general debate in either the Senate or the House of Commons.

The fact of the matter is that this is what should happen. I believe that what the Senate should do is refuse this bill. It ought to do so on the basis that the House of Commons must bring forward a proper bill, refer it to a committee, hear argument, have full debate, pass it, and then send it to the Senate for approval. If that is not to happen, then it is my belief that what we ought to do here is refer the matter to a committee, and undertake the process I have referred to ourselves.

● (1520)

So, honourable senators, I cannot add to the debate. All I could say has been said by others, and far more eloquently. I merely want to put on record the fact that I will vote for a

referral of the bill to a Senate committee for proper hearing, or I will vote against the motion for second reading.

Hon. Hazen Argue (Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board): Honourable senators, this has been a difficult question over the years for many of you, and, no doubt, for many members in the other place; but it seems to me that, as a nation and as a Parliament, we have dealt with important and difficult questions in the past, all of which were part of our evolution as a nation.

Hon. David Walker: There was a vote of 13 out of 282. Have we ever done that before?

Senator Argue: It was unanimous.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

Senator Argue: It was done properly. The Conservatives were represented there too. I believe, from what I have read, that the leader of the Conservative Party, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, is in favour of this bill.

Hon. Raymond. J. Perrault (Leader of the Government): And Stanley Knowles, and Walter Baker.

Senator Argue: So it was done properly. It was done under the rules of the House of Commons. If one wishes to go back in history, one will find that it is not the first time that this was done in the House of Commons.

Senator Walker: Are you in favour of its being done in that way?

Senator Argue: Of this bill?

Senator Walker: Are you in favour of the way it was done in the House of Commons?

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Give him time to finish.

Senator Argue: I am in favour of its being done in the form of a public bill in the name of a private member, and I cannot see why anyone, in either the House of Commons or the Senate, as an individual member of either house, should say, "The government has to do it; the government has to bring it in." Of course, if the government brought it in, then honourable senators opposite would say, "It's a party matter, a political matter; they are going to use their majority to shove it down our throats."

I was saying it is a difficult bill, a difficult subject. It is difficult for some people to decide whether or not July 1 should be called "Canada Day" or "Dominion Day". I was raised on the prairies—

Hon. Jacques Flynn (Leader of the Opposition): You grew up on the prairies.

Senator Argue: Those interruptions are getting some attention from senators close to the honourable senator who leads the opposition, but not much from other honourable senators.

When July 1 arrived it was generally not known as "Dominion Day" but as the "July 1st holiday". Canada is evolving as a nation and in its national aspirations. I was in the other place

when the Canada Citizenship Act was passed, and I have been proud to say I am a citizen of this country. I was on Parliament Hill when we decided it was okay for a Canadian to occupy the position of Governor General, and I believe that to have been a good move. I was not here at the time, but I followed closely the legislation adopting the Canadian flag. That was a difficult process and there was great division, not only as to whether there should be a distinctive Canadian flag but also as to what its design should be. I believe that Canadians today are happy that we have a Canadian flag, and most are happy with the design. We adopted "O Canada" as our national anthem, and I believe that Canadians are happy with that. Our Constitution is now home.

I forecast that this legislation will pass, and that when it passes, and we have adopted "Canada Day" and the debate is behind us, we are not likely to have private members' bills seeking to change the name once again.

Senator Walker: Can twelve people change it again?

Senator Frith: You will have your turn.

Senator Argue: If it is changed again, with the unanimous approval of the quorum, or whatever number there may be in the House of Commons, and that quorum is recognized by the Speaker, and the measure is given Royal Assent, then I believe that will be the proper and constitutional way to do it.

An Hon. Senator: Sleazy.

Senator Argue: How many Conservatives were in the House? I do not propose to cast an aspersion on the Conservative members in the other place. I have been around here since 1945. I sat for 18 years in the House of Commons. This discussion is not new. I believe there have been approximately 23 private members' bills over the years seeking to have this done—

Senator Walker: Not with a vote of thirteen.

Senator Argue: Back in 1946 a bill was presented by Mr. A. P. Côté of Matapédia-Matane. It was Bill No. 8, respecting "Canada Day", a public bill in the name of a private member. The date was April 4, 1946. It was a simple bill. The subheading that appeared in *Hansard* was: "Substitution of Word 'Canada' for Word 'Dominion'." The bill had a good deal of support. I could quote from views expressed by honourable members who participated in the debate. They sound similar to what is being said in connection with the present bill. Here is one quote:

To me the name Canada has music in it. To me it represents the greatest country on earth.

That was said by Mr. Daniel McIvor, the member for Fort William.

The debate continued and there were a number of votes taken on the question. It was moved by Mr. Tom Church, of Toronto, that the bill "be not now read a second time but this day six months hence." That motion was defeated. Another motion was moved that the committee rise and report progress, and that also was defeated. Then there was the vote on the bill itself. The yeas totalled 129, and the nays 59. So a bill, similar

to Bill C-201 now before us, was passed by the House of Commons by a large majority on April 4, 1946.

Senator Walker: What was the wording of the bill?

An hon. Senator: There was good government.

Hon. George J. McIlraith: May I ask the honourable senator a question? Would he not agree that that bill was passed after a full debate in the other place?

Senator Argue: Yes, it was passed after a debate that took up a large part of a day. I guess that is a full debate.

Senator McIlraith: Would the honourable senator not agree that the earlier bill as well as the "O Canada" bill were passed after debate and referral to committee. The flag bill was examined at many committee sittings at which many representations were heard.

Senator Argue: This debate has been going on in Canada in many forms for 30 years. It has been going on in Parliament for 30 years. I have mentioned the debate held in 1946. It is interesting to note that the list of those who voted yea in support of the bill in 1946 includes the names Argue and McIlraith. I was in good company in those days, and, in connection with second reading of the bill now before us, I anticipate that I will be in good company again.

The Senate did not exactly cover itself in glory. I believe that back in 1946 it moved to send the bill to committee. I hope that in 1982 honourable senators will take a more progressive attitude and will not try to send the bill to committee, which, in view of the possibility that we may be adjourning in a few days, is likely, in effect, to kill the bill.

I believe the Senate is now really under the gun. I believe the Senate is being watched. I believe the Senate will do itself justice if it supports the bill and passes it. I take second place to no one in this chamber—and I do not want anyone to take second place to me—in believing I am a good Canadian. I believe that Canadians generally, by a growing majority, think that we should know July 1 as "Canada Day". I am pleased to repeat in 1982, when the opportunity arises, that I support the same kind of favourable vote for the same kind of bill that I voted for on April 4, 1946. My only hope is that in 1982 the Senate will act responsibly and pass the bill.

● (1530)

Senator Walker: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I rise on what, I suppose, is a point of order. I do not intend to oppose the motion that the debate be adjourned, but I hope that honourable senators will remember that, as I said earlier, the government wishes this bill to come to a vote and to pass before the recess. It also wishes all honourable senators to have an opportunity to debate it. Of course, we do try to have, as we have had today, more than one or two interventions per sitting. I hope that honourable senators who wish to intervene in the debate will be ready to do so soon.

[Senator Argue.]

Senator Flynn: I am sure Senator Walker is prepared to yield to anyone who is ready to speak.

Senator Frith: Yes, I am sure he is.

Senator Flynn: Then I do not see why the honourable senator intervened at this point.

Senator Frith: The reason I intervened is to inform honourable senators that I hope there will be many speakers tomorrow.

Senator Flynn: We have had enough for today.

Hon. Daniel A. Lang: Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order. Last night I asked the Chair for a ruling with respect to the relationship of Bill C-201 to Rule 93. I am wondering whether that ruling will come forward at an early date, or, at least, before the conclusion of the debate on second reading.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tem: The Speaker will be here tomorrow, at which time he will give his ruling.

On motion of Senator Walker, debate adjourned.

SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY BILL, 1982-83

SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from yesterday, the debate on the motion of Senator Frith for the second reading of Bill C-125, to provide supplementary borrowing authority.

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, we now have to make a complete change in our mental scenery. We are shifting minds from Bill C-201, which deals with the name of our national holiday, to the consideration of some of the mundane facts and statistics, mostly unpleasant, in connection with our economic situation, and in particular, Bill C-125. For the last little while we have been discussing a bill that has to do with one of the important national symbols of the country, and it is only natural that such a discussion should engage our attention and our emotions on a quite different level from the subject matter about which I propose to say a few words now.

Bill C-125 has to do with the power the government seeks to borrow money to pay the bills of the country. This capital loan bill is really, in effect, a crystallization of a trend in the public financing and public management of our economy that goes back over some period of time. It represents as well a climax in our economic affairs. It brings us to a point in connection with the fiscal management of the country which we have never seen before and, I feel sure, some of us wish we did not have to face today. However, the facts are different.

I want to make one minor comment before I get into the bulk of what I have to say. It has to do with the subject of lapsing. As I recall, the Deputy Leader of the Government, when speaking on his motion for the second reading of this bill, made a point to the effect that the government had given up the policy of carrying borrowing authority on beyond the end of the fiscal year, and that any unspent monies would lapse. That is what I thought as well, until I read the bill.