

Canada Day Act

are not sympathetic to the idea of changing Dominion of Canada Day to Confederation Day or even refining it further to Canada Day. It is not Confederation Day as far as Manitoba is concerned. It is Dominion of Canada Day and that, of course, is enshrined in the official motto inscribed in the stonework at the entrance to this building, *A mari usque ad mare*—"He shall have dominion from sea to sea." I think it would be most inappropriate in this year 1867—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dinsdale: I beg your pardon; I meant to say 1970. I see some of my hon. friends are amused.

An hon. Member: Keep up to date.

Mr. Stanfield: We are living in 1970, unlike some of you fellows.

● (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Dinsdale: My hon. friends on the opposite side of the House are seeing much hilarity in this matter. I was going to make the point that in the year 1970, when Manitoba is celebrating its entry into Confederation, we should stop juggling history in this respect and trying to rewrite it by substituting words that are fundamental in describing the historical process that has gradually seen this nation evolve from its beginning in 1867. Manitoba entered Confederation in 1870, and British Columbia in 1871. The two Prairie provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan entered in 1905. I am reminded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) that Prince Edward Island, which really sarterd the whole process, came in in 1873. More recently, the dominion of Newfoundland came in 1949. This is a part of Canada which has been described as Britain's oldest colony—the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) will correct me if I am wrong—and it has been called Canada's newest dominion, I think that is the word used, or at least our newest province.

In 1967 we celebrated Canada's 100th birthday. In that year an attempt was made by Canadians in all the provinces to look back on our history and our origins. I believe it was Sir Edmund Burke, known as the father of philosophic conservatism, who said that a nation which had no regard for its history or its ancestry had very little hope of posterity.

In recognizing this principle of nationhood, we realize, as the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. Peters) has pointed out, that we have no revolutionary tradition. If ours had been such a tradition, we would likely have

no nation today. Our traditions are evolutionary. We have developed a national consensus because we have moved forward on the basis of accumulated traditions. It is the revolutionary nation which suddenly leaps forward with new names and new ideas, dramatically repudiating their past. In the past week throughout the world there has been some observance of the glorious October Revolution of 1917 when a nation broke with its traditions. Talk about rewriting history! As I read the reports there have been attempts to elevate the conduct of that revolution, one Lenin, from sinner to saint. They are trying to place around the head of that individual the halo of saintliness.

Another revolutionary change was marked by the rise to power of the nazi movement in Germany. When Hitler was reminded that history would condemn him for his actions, he said history would never condemn him because he would rewrite it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Dinsdale: We do not want to rewrite history in those terms.

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired and according to the order passed by the House this afternoon the time allotted for private members' business has also expired.

I think I owe it to hon. members to refer briefly to the procedural aspect of the bill and the amendments now before the House. The Chair has had serious doubts whether this amendment is in order, in the sense that what we have before us—as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—is not the bill which stood originally in the name of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Brown) but an entirely new bill. What we have been considering, substantially, is a bill standing in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson). It might well be argued that under the terms of our standing orders, if the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth wanted this bill to be considered he should have introduced it in the same way as the hon. member for Brant introduced his own measure.

The question is whether a bill can be so amended in committee that it is not the same bill at all as when it came before the House. As the hon. member pointed out, the only thing left of the original bill is its number. I did not raise this point earlier, realizing that hon. members were anxious to discuss both aspects of this proposal. At the same time, I