

tions. I know not as to the truth of that, but certainly national unity cannot mean religious unity. I suppose it needs no argument to maintain the position that national unity cannot mean language unity.

There will be two languages spoken in Canada, at least for some time to come. Can we expect national unity on political questions? That does not seem very probable within the near future. Then what is left? Wherein may we look for national unity? That, to my mind, is a very serious and a very important question. If we cannot find it within the realm of the religious, of the political, or of the racial, where shall we find it? There is only one other realm, it seems to me, in which we can find it. I believe that our national unity will ultimately be found in our national objective, and I contend that this country at the present time has no national objective. Our fathers founded this federation fifty years ago, with marvellous foresight they built for the future. During the first half century of Confederation we were engrossed with things material, necessarily and properly so, in the building up of the country, in the development of our industry, and in the bringing of settlers to this land. We were engrossed with the material, which to a certain extent was praiseworthy. Then came the war, which did more than anything else—and I do not hesitate in saying it—to unite the peoples of Canada. It did more towards that end, I believe, than any other single event in our national history. Where, then, can we find such a national objective, as will make real the ideal that is before us? In my opinion, Sir, it can be found, and must be found in the realm of the ethical. Different races, different religions, different political views, even different languages may find in a common ethical objective a bond of unity that will embrace in its manifold ramifications the other divergencies which I have enumerated; and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that such a bond of unity can be found in the ethical.

If I were an artist and had the ability, I would paint a national escutcheon for the peoples of the provinces of this Dominion, from sea to sea, something after this fashion: I would paint the word "Truth," and beside it the word "Honour," and in the background I would in some manner suggest the idea of toleration; and with that before the people, I believe we should have the possibility of national unity that would be the salvation of Canada and the making of a great Canadian nation and Canadian people—a possibility that does

[Mr. Stacey.]

not otherwise seem in sight. What do I mean, Sir, by truth? Why, that suggests, indeed it compels, the very thought of education. Truth is knowledge; it bears the sign "we must know." And I would go so far as to hope that every child born in this Dominion would have a good common school education, without an exception. This, I submit, should be a part of our national provision for the future; and in the matter of education there looms up in the distance, ultimately, not only the possibility but the necessity of a great national university.

I am in full accord with that sentence uttered only recently, I think, by Principal McKay of the University of Saskatchewan, when he said in substance that the greatest mistake the British nation ever made was that of allowing Germany to assume the role of the schoolmaster of the world. I believe he was correct. Germany was looking for truth, but she lacked honour, and the one is as essential as the other to true nationhood. We must have for the future of our country, Sir, the highest possible educational advantages for those who can reach them; and by the use of the word "can" I do not mean mere monetary ability; I mean mental capacity and moral calibre adequate to fit them for the great work that lies before them. I maintain that this Dominion should make it possible for every youth who has the character to attain the very highest position in the realm of service for the country that is obtainable anywhere; and we can do that—not perhaps in the near future, but in the distant future at any rate—through a great national post-graduate university. Why should we not be able to supply in Canada all that our land needs for its development materially, ethically or educationally? Associated with this thought is the idea of honour. If we could by any means adopt that two-fold principle of truth coupled with honour, the charges that we have listened to, and the accusations that we have heard against the manhood of our country, would very largely disappear. These things are the children of dishonour; and so long as dishonour rather than honour prevails, we shall have trouble—trouble in the House, and trouble everywhere.

The universal consensus of opinion is that we need a higher type of manhood and a nobler type of womanhood. With all deference to the womanhood of our country, I think—and undoubtedly they will be the first to endorse my opinion—that we need on the whole, even in Canada, a still nobler type of womanhood. Therefore, back of all