

steed, remarks: "That's a hell of a way to run a railroad."

This is a good summation, so far as it goes. I do think Canadian standards of taste are deeply offended by the kind of performance which is commonplace in the kind of committees run by people like Senators Jenner and McCarthy. This is not the way we do our business. Just the same, the way our neighbors do their business is not our business, and we should not slip into the error of criticizing them because they do it differently from us. We should do that only when their methods, which we don't like, impinge on us. But, so far as possible we should not go out of our way to behave like Pharisees and turn our noses up when our American friends propose and employ techniques of which we profoundly disapprove. There are a lot of factors involved. There are differences of taste, of legal practices, and, above all, of political tradition. We are -- the United States and Canada -- both democracies, but we should never slide into the error of thinking that we operate in the same way just because we speak the same language.

We should have learned that by now, and the question of espionage is a good case in point. The United States has never had a Gouzenko. It has never had the experience of going through the revelations which we endured when our Royal Commission held its hearings and made its report in 1946. I don't know what the consequences would have been, if that had been the case. But I do know that the way Canadians faced up to that situation is, looking back at it, pretty good. Gouzenko told us about the operations of one spy ring, which was cleaned up. But he also told us -- and the Royal Commission so reported -- that it was only one of several; and the others have never been uncovered. Or, if they have, we have known nothing of it. In our own way, we went to work. The evidence was handed over to the Mounted Police, and they have handled it since. We have also conducted a thorough survey of the connections of our own public servants, and this has been carried out, I am sure thoroughly, but without fanfare. Now and again some case is reported to Parliament, but the Government, to its very great credit, refuses to be drawn into making detailed statements about it. The job is done quietly and, I am sure, competently, and we feel happy about the results. That is our way of doing things, and it suits us better than the different methods employed by our neighbors.

But there was, and there is, something much more important to be considered than questions of taste and decorum. We may consider the methods used by Senators Jenner and McCarthy both vulgar and destructive, but that fact does not account for the outburst of public sentiment in this country last November and December. It is something far more deep-seated and fundamental. It is something about ourselves of which we are, as a general rule, barely conscious; and it goes to the very root of our nationhood.

It is not a simple nationhood. Far from it. We have spent most our time in Canada looking for what we learned in school about the largest common factor, and it is not always as large as we would like it to be. However, let's take a look at it. We have to begin with the French of the St. Lawrence Valley. There has never been any doubt