

treasure. Our cultural heritage is vastly richer because of their presence amongst us, and I am expressing heartfelt sentiments when I say that the potentiality of our national future will depend upon the continued gifts which they can bestow upon our citizenship.

The time has come for those who believe in the existence of a Canadian nation to stand up and say so in no uncertain tone. Let us find out in this time of heart searching and intellectual reasoning if insuperable obstacles stand in the way of real Canadian nationhood; and if so, let us be honest enough to identify them and face them.

In this seventy-fifth anniversary year of Confederation, as I read the declarations of our fathers, so eloquently expressed in the days preceding our birth, and try to interpret the faith that was in them, I am inclined to think that we have fallen far below the national standards and objectives which they had in mind.

Let me quote briefly from some of the outstanding statements of those great men. Sir George Etienne Cartier, who was Macdonald's lieutenant from Quebec in the Confederation period, said:

Shall we be content to maintain a mere provincial existence, when by combining together we could become a great nation? . . . Objection has been taken to the scheme now under consideration because of the words, New Nationality. Now, when we are united, if union be attained, we shall form a political nationality with which neither the National origin, nor the religion of any individual will interfere.

Macdonald himself said:

One of the great advantages of Confederation is that we shall have a united, a concentrated and uniform system of defence—and be one people acting alike in peace and war.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee, whose poetic eloquence made him an outstanding advocate of Confederation as the groundwork of a new nation, said:

I hope to see the day when there will be no other term for our patriotism but Canadian without the prefix, either French, or English.

Alexander Galt, said:

Half a continent is ours, if we do not keep on quarrelling about petty matters and lose sight of what interests us most.

George Brown, who is given credit for having first mentioned Confederation, said:

A federal union cannot be considered for Canada alone, but must include all British America.

The great Joseph Howe, from Nova Scotia, declared:

Out of this discussion may arise a spirit that may lead North America to cast aside her colonial habiliments, to put on national aspects.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT.

And Charles Tupper, also from Nova Scotia, said:

At great international conferences, Canada takes her place side by side with other powers upon equal terms.

Finally, it was Samuel Tilley from New Brunswick who described the new federation in the Scriptural words:

He shall have Dominion from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the earth.

The acid test of any nation's status comes when it has to deal with matters of peace and war. Those were the subjects which concerned the minds of the men who made Confederation. How have we dealt with them since that time? By slipping as easily as possible between Imperialist sentiment on the one hand and an entirely isolationist position on the other. And this has been done, in the final analysis, by permitting our fortunes in war and in peace to be determined for us by a Minister of Foreign Affairs living two thousand miles away, a member of a Government over which we have no control whatsoever. Technically, when it comes to a showdown, as it did in September, 1939, we can say that Canada declared war by the vote of her own Parliament and entered the lists at the side of Britain as a free nation; but actually and realistically, apart from the parliamentary procedure involved, Canada committed herself in this war without a due understanding or appreciation of all that was involved in it, including the underlying causes and policies which led up to it.

I like to say, and to think, that the Canadians who are taking part in the present war, regardless of where they are, have only one thought, namely the defence of Canada.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Nothing else?

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: But we have the spectacle to-day in this Dominion of a large section of our population placing a definite limitation upon that point of view. Why? In my opinion it is because up to now the matter of the defence of Canada, the position of Canada as a nation in this world, if you like, has not been faced realistically. It has not been faced realistically because our Governments and our people have been content, evidently, to concern themselves in the main with all the domestic politics of an internal physical development, and have left questions of international relationships to the more or less unknown channels running from our Department of External Affairs in Ottawa to London and Washington. We have been content with our own geographical position of seeming security in North America, on the