

*The Address—Mr. Thompson*

different members old and new from all corners of the house. This does not apply to the members themselves alone; it also applies to their wives and the parliamentary staff. Certainly they have made us all feel at home in our capital city and on capital hill. Again, I am much more impressed by the friendliness and the hospitalities of the members than I am by some of their political tactics and jargons, as we have watched them for the last several days. It has reminded me of a neighbour farmer of mine who one day last year, when the fields were very parched, stood with me and looked out across these parched fields, and then up at the stormy clouds above, and said: "Lots of thunder and wind, no rain". There has been a deluge of words but a desert of ideas.

Most people are interested in debates and fights in their proper place, but surely the people of this country will resent to know that any portion of the tremendous sum of money which is required to maintain parliament is being used as a personal tilting ground for a couple of their fellow citizens. Personally, speaking for some colleagues and myself, we are here to do business, to come to grips with the internal problems of Canada so that she can be a strong voice in a troubled world. We are not here to waste time on trivialities. So much of what has been said in the last two days smacks of the beating of party drums and all the while the world crumbles around our feet. Mr. Speaker, we have had before us a spectacle of a couple of household watchdogs fighting about who is going to protect the house, when all the while the house is in flames. Action is what is needed.

Before I move an amendment to the amendment of the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Pearson), may I congratulate the government on the speech from the throne, for its literary content, for its vagueness and for its generality. In fact, it was a masterful piece of window dressing designed to cover over its inadequacies and omissions. It is an admission of failure. Much of it is merely a rehash of the 1957 and 1958 election platforms, plus every speech from the throne since. If the government had carried out its previous election promises plus the promises and assurances contained in speeches from the throne since 1957, 80 per cent of this speech from the throne could have been left out. It would have been redundant. It is an admission by the government that it expects to be eliminated before it gets an opportunity to formulate another speech from the throne.

Yes, it is all too obvious also that the leader of the official opposition is determined to cut the life of this parliament as short as possible. He has stated that it is his first duty

to this parliament to oppose the government. I disagree with the hon. member. I was elected and I believe it is my duty to represent the citizens of my constituency and at the same time, as a Canadian, to preserve the best interests of my country. However, I must congratulate the leader of the official opposition and the Prime Minister as well for a most eloquent delivery. In fact, I do not think I have ever heard either of them in better oratorical form. However, I must say that I am unimpressed with what has been said. It is, in fact, depressing.

I am glad that the people of Canada did not have the opportunity to listen to this debate on the speech from the throne by television. If they had, they might have thought they had tuned in Havana by mistake where they are accustomed to listening to tirades of three hours and four hours in length. It might be a good idea for the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Flemming) to explore the possibility of getting a sponsor for the television production of the proceedings in parliament. This is a great show. It is a frightful charge that this should be so in this democratic institution whose purpose is supposed to be to grapple with the problems that could spell life or death for this country. If I really could have confidence in the words of the leader of the official opposition, it might be easier to sympathize with him. To the public he shouts "We must have an election now". To his own party members he says something else. At least he is quoted in *La Femme Liberale*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, September, 1962 as follows, and I quote a transliteration from the French:

When we meet in Quebec city—

That is for the national congress.

—parliament will then be in session for one month. What will then be the situation? We will probably have a more enlightening perspective of the future.

It is no wonder that the people of Canada are confused. That is why I am convinced that, if we were to turn the two old line parties loose in another election at this time, it would only add chaos to confusion. Given a few more months for the people of this nation to listen to more of what we have heard yesterday and so far today, perhaps it would not take too long for the Canadian public to understand that they have no hope whatsoever in either of the old line parties. I think it might be a good thing if they added the word "Columbus" to their names. At least this honourable gentleman of centuries past would give some dignity to the names they now carry. He is defined as the man who started out without knowing where he