

from luncheon table to luncheon table vainly seeking confirmation that he has sighted a dragon.

We have been reminded in recent days that the violence which is now so familiar to so many countries is no stranger to Canada. We have seen evidence in Canada this past summer of challenges to some of our most cherished concepts. We have been told by some that the air that we have so long believed to be as free as any in the world, that the equality which we thought was so widespread in practice, that the simple tolerance and goodwill of one Canadian to another—that these beliefs and these criteria are misleading or false. We are challenged and we must respond. The response cannot be a forfeiture of our values, but it must include a sincere attempt to ensure that all Canadians have available to them effective avenues for social change and political action. It must include as well, however, an expression of our strong belief that liberty and anarchy are contradictory, that democracy and violence cannot co-exist, that our freedom is dependent upon wise restraints.

If Canadians are unable to pursue a system of peaceful resolution of problems, then what persons are? If we, who associate one with the other within a framework as flexible as is federalism, who are predisposed to tolerance, and who enjoy the benefits of linguistic and cultural differences—if we still depart from reason, then surely we are in no position to criticize other countries for their social difficulties.

I believe that we can profit from the knowledge that violence begets violence, that the experience of man demonstrates with blinding clarity that in a jungle all are not equal, but all are vulnerable.

Freedom and liberty are neither gained nor retained without cost. The cost takes the form of a burden which demands of us all the human elements of responsibility, trust and common sense—responsibility, because every Canadian is a participant in the democratic process; trust to promote reasonable, reasoned argument; common sense to enable us to see what is, and what is not possible and desirable.

In these respects, we here in this House have both the opportunity and the responsibility to demonstrate to all Canadians that in our common commitment to Canada and to the democratic process we are capable of producing enlightened debate and wise decisions. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, as I know do all hon. members, to a session which will bring distinction to this Parliament and to those who have the honour to sit within it, and which will contribute to a better Canada in a better world.

● (2:50 p.m.)

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted, at the outset, to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder, and to say that we all enjoyed the speeches made by the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I assure the hon. member for Assiniboia that I, and I hope many hon. Members of Parliament, will accept his invitation to return to Saskatchewan next year. The hon. member said that we might see the fields of waving grain. I was in the hon. member's

*The Address—Mr. T. C. Douglas*

constituency this fall, and mostly I saw waving fields of summerfallow, some of which had been summerfallowed two years in succession because that is the only way those farmers could obtain the quotas which would enable them to sell the grain they had on hand. I must say that I could not find the same satisfaction with the government's policies or the same optimism for agriculture which the hon. member described in his speech yesterday.

I listened with interest to the Prime Minister's speech which, I thought, could have been entitled, "Canada as seen from the Caribbean, British Guiana and the Mediterranean." It was the usual elitest speech on Canada seen from the seats of affluence. That speech, Mr. Speaker, like the Speech from the Throne which I imagine came from the same author, was long on platitudes and short on policies.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** The people in this country want programs and they are being given clichés and purple prose. In this Speech from the Throne, the government poses all the right questions but does not supply any of the answers.

**An hon. Member:** Let us have them.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** The speech, for instance, says, "... a society which is not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of the name." I suggest that love and compassion are meaningless sentiments unless they are expressed in social action based on social justice.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** The Speech from the Throne states a great many problems but it offers very few solutions. For instance, it says, "It would be irresponsible to suggest that the economy is now in a satisfactory condition." Mr. Speaker, that can go down as the understatement of the year. The speech goes on to say, "When costs rise more rapidly than productivity, when men and women are unable to gain employment, when a reasonable distribution of the wealth of Canada is denied to certain sectors or regions, then these are matters for deep concern." Mr. Speaker, they are not only matters for deep concern; they are matters which call for immediate remedial action. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne to indicate that some remedial action will be forthcoming.

The stagnant state of the economy and the consequences which flow from it is the No. 1 issue facing the Canadian people and there is nothing in this Speech from the Throne which even indicates that the government has any intention of taking steps to activate the economy and get it moving again. This document is full of perfumed rhetoric that speaks glowingly of desirable goals without delineating any plan for achieving them or any commitment for their realization. This is cheap soap opera psychology which dangles the vision of a just society before the eyes of the public and, at the same time, the govern-