

to speak more sensibly than when they merely rehash the opinions dictated by their party leaders—he expressed the view, that, as far as the Labrador case was concerned, as between Quebec and Newfoundland, an interesting situation had arisen out of the declaration of equality of status pronounced by the imperial conference of 1926. That is, if Canada and Newfoundland and the other British countries, miscalled the British Commonwealth of Nations, have difficulties among themselves, those difficulties should not come under the jurisdiction of the judicial committee of the privy council, but be submitted to some impartial body, akin to the arbitration tribunal of the Hague. The question is worth while pondering by the government and by all thinking people in this country.

Another thought expressed by the hon. gentleman is worth while underlining, I should think. First, I must, as a friend of the late member for Laprairie-Napierville, dear old Roch Lanctôt, express my personal thanks to the present member (Mr. Dupuis) for his kind references to his predecessor. May I also give him this advice—to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor, especially when the military estimates come up in this house, and thus show himself a worthy representative of the free people of this country who would like to have a peace policy, and a true national policy, prevail over military and imperial tendencies.

Now, to my dear old friend—if I may call him so without compromising him too much—the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett), may I say, and to the whole house, that I have rarely listened to a wittier speech, or a speech more happily delivered, than the one he gave us last night? From a purely intellectual point of view it was a treat. I thank him for it. And may I take advantage of my white hair to give him this piece of friendly advice: let him rely upon his own thoughts, let him express his own opinions as frequently as the exigencies of leadership will permit him—which is not very frequent. May I interject here a thought that came to my mind last night? Long ago I had been struck by the physical and, to a certain extent, the mental resemblance between the hon. gentleman and that distinguished English statesman, Mr. Winston Churchill. Everybody who knows the two men will take that as a compliment to both. In this connection I was reminded at once of a passage in that delightful book, the Diaries of Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, a book which is not yet much read, but which in years to come will rival Samuel Pepys' papers. In one of his daily notes which he wrote down every night, he said: "Winston

[Mr. Bourassa.]

was here last night; talked delightfully for an hour on Irish affairs, just the opposite of what he said in the house a week ago." But what shows the superiority of the hon. gentleman over his—should I say?—Sosia of England is that he can afford to go on without contradicting himself too much.

There are a few points in the delightful address of the hon. gentleman with which I agree, and I want to state them at once. First, with regard to the style of the speech from the throne. The only difference between my friend and myself is this. I have listened to or read, either as a member of the house or as a spectator in the old press gallery, speeches from the throne for the last forty years. I was struck with the same idea when reading or listening to every one of them, and I can remember the same denunciation being made of the emptiness of their contents by all leaders of the opposition from 1891 down. Sir Wilfrid Laurier used to say in his eloquent manner: "Mr. Speaker, that speech is more remarkable for what it omits than for what it contains." Then from 1896 to 1900, we—I was going to refer to yourself, Mr. Speaker, not noticing that the real Speaker (Mr. Lemieux) was not in the chair, he and I being the only two left from the membership of those days—from 1896 to 1900, it was Sir Charles Tupper, thundering in his powerful voice against the emptiness of "that piece of nonsensical literature, the speech from the throne." Then later on, in a milder manner, with perhaps a little more profound thought, Sir Robert Borden used to speak of the difficulty of understanding what there was in the speech from the throne, and finding out what was not there.

I have long ago come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that since we are evolving into a new state of policy and democracy, Canada should inaugurate a reform, small in itself, but one which perhaps would give contentment to the common sense of a common sense people, that is, simply enunciate what the government intends submitting to the house, and leave it to the newspapers, to the commentators, and to the orators who have no thoughts of their own, to dilate upon the good or bad times, the state of the weather, the prosperity or otherwise of the country, and so forth. Especially since it has been decided that the governor general is no more a mere agent of the government in London, but the true personification of the king, I think it is unfair to force him to sign under his own name and to pronounce in a magnificent garment while seated on the throne in the red chamber, such elementary truths as: the wheat we have not sold we still hold; intimating that were