

that if it is desired that the difficulty of minority members be overcome, there is a way to overcome it.

The speech from the throne in its entirety is a preparation of the government. His Excellency in delivering it is expressing the government's policy and programme. Members of the house have become accustomed to the discursive style of these speeches; and when I talk about this speech from the throne, a good deal of what I say can be said about many speeches from the throne in different houses in this and other lands. This one is no exception to the rule. In that respect we are not surprised. From the beginning it is padded with verbiage to give it the appearance of substance. As a matter of fact it is barren of hope or promise for the Canadian people. Let us take a look at it.

It is full of generalizations, perhaps more so than any I have heard, but empty of information or promise of direct or practical action on domestic problems. On external matters, it is a little clearer, a little more informative, although on certain of them very little light is given us as to any positive active policies. The speech is full of vapourings, designed to cover up the decline of liberalism. The party which once found itself in the valley of humiliation now finds itself bogged down ever more deeply in the valley of indecision and inertia. The captain of the ship is about to depart; his orders are drowned in the confusion of the crew; the mates are scrambling for cover; even the famous chart has become outdated and the famous compass is rusted from lack of use. The Prime Minister, always long on psychology, continues his essay writing, at which he is very good. In this address he has given the people of Canada chiefly straws with which to make bricks. After a quarter century in the promised land liberalism has lost its bearings and sees itself headed for a long period of wanderings in the wilderness.

The third and fourth paragraphs of the speech from the throne touch upon an international matter, the question of peace. One point in connection with that problem impressed me very greatly as I sat with members of the government and the leader of the C.C.F. party for six or eight weeks last fall at the united nations general assembly in New York. I want to take two or three minutes to refer to it here.

At the moment one can see no early threat of a major war. As to the more distant future, one cannot speak with the same assurance. The danger at the moment does not lie in the warlike propensities of any nation.

[Mr. Bracken.]

Germany has been destroyed and cannot rise again in our time. The danger now lies not in the desire for war on the part of any country but in the consequences of the clash of two opposing ideologies in the world, communism and democracy. As I see it, the greatest threat to the peace of the world in our time is communist intolerance. The majority of communists hold the view that there is not room in the world for these two ideologies, that one or other must go and that the one to disappear must be democracy. By such an intolerant philosophy, combined with the militant propagation of its views, communism carries with it the potential seeds of a major war.

Our answer to that threat must be twofold. We must prevent the expansion of communism by the superiority of our own economy. The democracies of the world can serve their peoples more effectively than communism serves the Soviet Union, and we must demonstrate that fact to every nation. That is the chief problem facing the democracies today. We are challenged by another philosophy. I believe we can meet that challenge. We must see that we do so.

I said I believed democracy could serve our society better than communism can serve Soviet Russia. Let me give an example. At that assembly in New York last fall, where delegates from fifty-one different nations sat down together, there came a time when the cost of carrying on these international organizations had to be figured out and assessed against the different nations taking part. The best accounting experts of those nations were called together to figure out how to arrive at what each nation should pay in carrying on the united nations general assembly and other organizations of the kind. They arrived at the conclusion that the nations should pay on the basis of capacity to pay. No one had any better plan. There were fifty-one nations, all of equal sovereignty, each with five delegates, some representing only one hundred thousand people and others representing four hundred million people. What did this report show? It showed that one nation of the fifty-one should pay not one fifty-first of the cost but 48.89 per cent of the total cost of the whole organization. What nation was that? It was our sister nation across the forty-ninth parallel, which was to pay 48.89 per cent, on the basis of capacity to pay, of the cost of an organization comprising all the nations of the world, with the exception of some that were our enemies in the last war, and a few others. The United Kingdom was expected to pay 10.5 per cent, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics 6 per cent and Canada, with one