

the "rebellion" had been not so much a native uprising as a succession of American raids; and from then on, he never quite lost a certain lingering anxiety for the problem of British North America."

This just comment of Creighton's, it seems to me, throws a flood of light upon much of our later history. Here was the potential meeting-ground for the French Canadians of the Lower St. Lawrence and the United Empire Loyalist and immigrant stock of the upper St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario. It took a long time indeed to bring the two together. It is a process that is not by any means completed. But it continues, and not least of the factors that has brought them together has been that "certain degree of lingering anxiety for the problem of British North America."

We have been, as Canadians, singularly unconscious of our history and the influences that have gone to our own making as a people. Yet it is distant, far-off events such as these that I have mentioned that provide the tap-roots of the emotions and instincts that now stir us. There has been, deep down in us for generations, an instinctive sense of caution in all our dealings with our great and more numerous neighbours south of the line, and it is a theme I will return to, after suggesting briefly one or two reasons why the theme has been until recently so largely obscured. I deal with it, not with any dogmatism but with the suggestion that we might talk about ourselves in terms of power politics instead of in the phrases which, in my young days and in yours, we used about them. I belong to a generation which, like most of you here today, talked of Canada's external relations in terms of colonialism, imperialism and nationalism. I belong to the generation which, like many of us, 25 or 30 years ago, was engaged in a great political and ideological struggle over what we called "Dominion status."

The term is one which, I am astonished now to learn, means hardly anything to my own children. They hardly know what I'm talking about. Yet, when I was young, it was a phrase which, to exaggerate a little, roused wild passions. For the assertion of it, my old newspaper in Winnipeg and its great chief, John W. Dafoe, were denounced by many decent and law-abiding citizens. Copies of the paper itself were once burned at the corner of Portage Avenue and Main Street in Winnipeg. My old boss, Dafoe, never one to take such things lying down, retorted in kind; and a wide vocabulary of invective and vituperation was richly used. The idea in those days was that anybody who fought for Dominion status was a traitor to the British Empire; whereas anyone, contrariwise, who withstood the movement to autonomy was a base-minded colonial lackey. No wonder we all got hot under the collar about it, and certainly we all said and did things which today can hardly remain, if I may use a famous phrase, "unrevised and unrepented." I think perhaps the time has come to try and put this controversy and those events into slightly wider context.

Let me try, and let me assure you, as I try, that I am only trying. I'm not being dogmatic about it. It does, however, seem to me now that what we were then doing as a nation, slowly becoming conscious of its own peculiar and distinctive place in the world, was to work out the transition from colonial status into something new. The predominant influence on the Canada of that day