

That is an example of the Senate interposing itself against the will of the government, as a Conservative-dominated Senate did later on the old age pension issue. When the Senate does that, it is not usually acting in the interest of the public. I mentioned the Conservatives in an intermediate period to indicate that that is not a circumstance peculiar to any particular party. That naturally happened more under the Liberals because, there were more instances when the Liberals had a majority here, as they had in the other place.

I remember other dramatic changes, as do many other senators in this chamber. I refer to that of 1957 when the government changed, and that of 1958 when we had an enormous majority. As Senator Walker will remember, it was then the greatest in the nation's history.

I have been casting my mind back to find the earliest and most applicable example of a comparable situation, and I found that the most apropos for comparison is 1854. John A. Macdonald we regard as the chief father of Confederation—there is a biological problem there—but let us say the leading father or leading architect, if that is what we savour. He always said that his greatest work was done before Confederation. Since no country as diverse as Canada could exist and hold together without a broadly-based party, he considered his biggest achievement to have been the forming in 1854 of the party of which I have been a member for a long, long time.

He reflected on a situation similar to that which Prime Minister Mulroney finds himself in today. He said:

There would be a new House and new people to choose from, and our aim should be to enlarge the bounds of our party so as to embrace every person desirous of being counted as a progressive Conservative—

and that is where the name of the party came from; not John Bracken.

He went on to state:

—and who will join in a series of measures to put an end to the corruption which has ruined the government and debauched its followers.

That is the kind of thing that might be going through the Prime Minister's mind; I do not know whether it is or not, but in that idea of a broadly-based party, of an ecumenical movement that would pull the country together and hold it together, it seems to me is the subtle essence of our party.

I believe that the great victory of the Progressive Conservative Party in September was underwritten largely by the tremendous victory in Quebec which, for years, was not very kind territory to us. I used to say that I knew every prominent Conservative in Quebec, and then I would say it did not take much recall to remember them all.

I also think that Mr. Mulroney won his Quebec victory in Manitoba. That may sound like a strange thing, but he went to Manitoba and said that which was not perceived to be very popular.

It is always said that John A. Macdonald was a great boozier, which he was, a great equivocater, which he could be, and a great conciliator, but in the man's life there were certain things in which he believed. Fundamental was his belief that there must be nothing but amity and comity between the people whose language was French and those whose language was English. He never tolerated any nonsense of bigotry on an ethnic or religious basis. Perhaps that is why it is sometimes good to have someone in power who is not too self-righteous about those things. He never tolerated that.

When Prime Minister Mulroney went to Manitoba and enunciated the very principle that he won his leadership on—co-operation between the two groups—naturally the people of Quebec were capable of perceiving what he was saying. In consequence, and this indicates, that there is justice in politics, he won both Quebec and Manitoba, which is encouraging, because winning office is a wonderful thing, and we who were denied it most of the time cherish it. To win office on something which is valid, eternal and fundamental makes it something less than just a transient popularity in a scatter of ballots.

That is why I said a few minutes ago that this is an epochal situation. I like the way in which—so far and I hope it will continue—the whole thing has been handled.

*The Globe and Mail* this morning said that the Speech from the Throne set a civil tone. Mr. L. Ian MacDonald in the *Gazette* used the very same word. It strikes me that the Speech from the Throne is another illustration of the decent reasonableness which prevails and which I hope will continue to prevail. In the face of such a large majority, and after so many lean and arid years, there might have been a temptation for a little gloating or a little heavy arrogance, but I have not seen that. It strikes me that someone has taken to heart the maxim of Winston Churchill, which was "In Victory—Magnanimity." If you follow that, you never lose.

Heaven knows what the situation will be in six months, in two years or in three years. But I believe that—if I understand the vagaries of public opinion—it is that attitude which has brought about the situation whereby the current government has enhanced its popularity rather than diminished it, a result which might be regarded as natural, which follows frequently and is almost always universal.

I liked the Speech from the Throne because in itself and in its tone it was positive, and it was well written, something I have not seen too often. Most of them, alas, are far from that. I cannot remember a Speech from the Throne getting such good reviews. They were almost rave reviews. I hear that the representatives of big business raved; the representatives of little business thought it was great; the representatives of labour thought it was fine. Everybody but the opposition thought it was good and no one would expect them to say it is good. Of course, that is never done.

● (1520)

If I were to be the typical mover I would give the Speech a benign overview. I am going to try to be benign, but I am not