

days—but they have been recently revived as one of the devices in the armoury of some who would bring down the Government.

This might be described by some as emotionalism, competitiveness, and the desperate ambition which seems to characterize some of the Opposition partisanship at this time, were it not for the clear evidence of the harm that has been done to Canada by those who seem to think that there is no other way to get into office than to deny Canada's progress, to undermine the confidence of Canadians in their country and to ridicule the honest efforts being made by others in the interests of the nation and its people.

And yet I have seen these things done within recent months, and I think I know enough about the mechanics of politics to recognize that some of them are organized.

Surely it is time to call a halt. Surely there are political actions which can be criticized, partisan politics which can be challenged, party programs which can be controverted, without resort to personal attacks on Canada and personal attacks on Canadians.

I recognize, of course, the truth of the old maxim—and I won't quote it in Latin—of Publilius Syrus two thousand years ago:

In heated argument we are apt to lose sight of the truth.

Surely this is not a time for us to lose sight of the truth. Let those who think it proper, seek to bring down the Government—nothing wrong in that. But let those of all political parties remember that one of the main functions of all political parties is to bring Canada up.

In closing I am going to let somebody else speak the last of my piece, the highly respected Mr. Floyd Chalmers, President of the Maclean-Hunter Publishing Company. They have just published a fine booklet, their 75th anniversary booklet, and over the signature of Mr. Floyd Chalmers, a distinguished Canadian; I read these words;

There has seldom been a time in Canada's history when there was not some large and vocal group arguing that Canada could not continue to survive as a nation.

In 1887, when this company was born, it was perfectly obvious to many people that the effort to create a coast-to-coast nation wasn't going to work. The Canadian Pacific Railway, just opened, wouldn't pay for its axle grease.

In 1912, this company was 25 years old. Canada has just finished a battle to prove that American Congressmen and journals were wrong as they clamored for the annexation of Canada.

I shall quote Mr. Chalmers' conclusion in a moment, but I should like to comment for a second on those two historical references, because I think there is nothing I can say that will point more truly to the real nature of the choice before the Canadian people today, between a Conservative administration and a Liberal administration.

The 1887 reference is, of course, to the infamous "axle-grease" statement by the great Liberal leader. The Liberals had the answer to this fundamental question that faced Canada then as it does now, and their answer, according to Professor Creighton, dean of Canadian history, was that

The very idea of a separate, viable Canada was a gigantic mistake.

That statement will be found in the latest history of Canada by Professor Creighton. The professor then goes on to say:

Unrestricted reciprocity obviously meant a violent and unqualified break with the basic principles of the national policy . . . The implications of the Liberals' new program for the whole future of the Dominion in North America were so sinister that a great many people drew back in alarm and consternation . . . The Liberals had already lost three elections and they and their new leader . . . were anxiously on the lookout for a new, a popular policy . . . Sir John A. Macdonald refused to accept the idea of defeat. He was determined to continue his chartered course . . . He was determined to negotiate—

This time it was with the United States—on nationally self-representing terms . . .

The result, as Professor Creighton puts it, was this:

Yet the instinct for survival, the desire for self-determining was strong . . . the Canadian people still clung with determination to their design of transcontinental nationhood.

In other words, then, as later and now, it was the traditional confidence of the Conservative party in Canada which gave political identification to the true spirit of the Canadian people.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Brantford):** Is the honourable senator still quoting?

**Hon. Mr. Grosart:** No, I am not. My quotation ended with the words "transcontinental nationhood". My last sentence was a comment that I ventured to put forth of my own accord.

I come now to Mr. Chalmers' reference to the election of 1911. The vital issue then,