

C A N D I D C O M M E N T S

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader,
Social Credit Party.

A NATIONAL CAPITAL DISTRICT

Ottawa, Canada's capital city, belongs to all Canadians. Just as a family takes pride in its home, Canadians should take pride in their capital and strive to make it as attractive as possible. Coupled with this, Ottawa and its people should reflect the personality of the nation it represents. It is my contention that the establishment of a federal district could be the answer to achieving this end and much more.

If our population grows no faster than it has over the past century, we shall be a nation of 200 million people by our second centennial. This rather astounding fact makes it vividly clear the urgency of planning now for a national capital worthy and adequate for a nation of that size.

The City of Hull, which is predominantly French speaking and the City of Ottawa, which is predominantly English speaking, appear as the major ingredients of a federal district. The entire area within a 30 mile radius of Parliament could well be formed into a national capital district. But Canada must avoid the pitfalls experienced in the United States in the formation of Washington, D.C. A stitching together of two cities is not enough. Particularly in the capital there must be a fusion of cultures and people, yet with each retaining his right to have a place and voice in the development of his district and nation. The population of a federal district must retain its democratic responsibilities and privileges in governing the district, although the people of this district are not the only ones who should have a say. If it is to be a capital for all of Canada, then all the provinces should participate in its planning, financing and development.

It is imperative that Canadians of every province and background feel at home in the national capital. This is especially true for the new Canadians who now represent nearly half the nation. Some have problems with language, of grasping our ideas and our ways of doing things. Ottawa then should be a city where the stranger feels welcome and feels strange no more. This is a responsibility that falls chiefly upon the shoulders of older Canadians of the two founding cultures.

There appears little reason to me why a federal district, as proposed, could not prove to be a point of lamination between Canada's two founding cultures of English and French. When Canadians of these two cultures can feel equally at home in this nation's capital, then it is logical to assume that other cultures that have played such an important part in the development of this nation we call Canada, can be made to feel at home as well. A federal district could set the example for the rest of Canada.

Science has proven that by laminating metals, plastics, woods or other similar materials, the end product has added and superior strength. The materials that go into the laminated product still retain their individual characteristics. If we are to take a lesson from science, it seems logical to assume that the good qualities of each culture can be retained and yet provide an end product exhibiting properties of greater strength.

A federal capital district could prove to be much more than just a method by which all Canadians could have a voice in the beautification and development of its capital city. There are very few who will deny that Canada, a country that has provided us with so much, is worth preserving as a nation. Anything that has the earmarks of achieving this purpose must be given an honest try.

Canadians must join forces and forge ahead. No matter what our

cultural backgrounds may be, we all have weak points and strong points. The government's student exchange programme has proven that Canadians, whether from eastern or western Canada, are basically the same and actually differ on very few points. Together let's go forward, play down our weak points and build on our strong points.

As Ottawa becomes one of the important capitals of the world, more and more visitors from other lands will come here. It will be the privilege of the inhabitants of Ottawa to act as hosts for the whole nation. As we build our nation, so can we develop our capital such that courtesy, helpfulness and pride in our heritage can become the Hallmark of all of us who live here.

The Senate appointments by Prime Minister Pearson are representative of little except the Liberal Party and its patronage system. Definitely they do not represent a cross section of the Canadian people, nor in any over-all sense the Canadian scene. One would have thought that the Prime Minister would have used the Senate to demonstrate non-partisan statesmanship in the appointment of Senators, using the advice of the provincial premiers to develop a better demonstration of co-operative federalism, a word he once used to indicate Liberal policy, but which long since has become relegated to the waste-paper basket.

Reform of the Senate, a topic which the Prime Minister, when Leader of the Opposition, dwelt on at great length, has likewise slipped into ignominious oblivion. Could it be that the Prime Minister, by maintaining the Senate as a retirement home for loyal Party workers, is really working towards the most drastic reform of all - abolition? Certainly by continuing to use it as a patronage tool, rejecting any real reform measures, he has adopted a sure course towards the abolition of the Senate. While it is my opinion that the Senate has a constructive and useful role in the parliamentary process, as it is now used for party patronage, the public image of Parliament would be strengthened if it were abolished.

There is an important place for the Upper House in Canada's parliamentary system. A review of appointment procedure should be the first step towards reforming the Senate. The only reform instituted in recent years has been to replace life appointments to the Senate with a retirement age of 75 years. It would be far more effective if Senate terms were limited to a specific number of years, with reappointment if ability and service warranted. Persons so appointed should be recommended by the respective provincial governments, to fulfil the important role which was originally intended for the Senate.

The contribution by the Senate as a "house of second thought," through important committees and inquiries and by prominent and respected Senators who work faithfully and well, is ample proof that the Senate is a legitimate and vital institution. However, if it is the intention of the Prime Minister to liquidate it entirely, all he need do is continue the old patronage system he now supports. It is a tragedy for Canada that politicians blindly insist on a course which will weaken and ultimately destroy the democratic and free way of life which has been our heritage and is our only hope for the future.

CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party

April 6, 1966

WHY DAMPEN THE BOOM?

While debate continues on the effectiveness of Finance Minister Sharp's provisions for dampening the economic boom, the question: "Does the boom need to be slowed?" remains unanswered.

Naturally a situation where inflation continues to spiral prices cannot be tolerated. To apply deflationary pressures to the extent that the economic bubble bursts is equally dangerous. Basically, however, it appears that Mr. Sharp was pondering how hard to step on the brake when he should really have been concentrating on the steering wheel.

That Canadian industry was not yet operating to full capacity was admitted by Trade Minister Winters in the preamble to his "guidelines" when he spoke of the need for Canadian-owned companies and U.S. subsidiaries alike to "strive for maximum realization of their potential and for full participation in the life of the Canadian community." If the economy is operating at capacity why are we involved in a war on poverty? Why is ARDA swamped with requests for rehabilitation projects? Why do we still have more than 300,000 unemployed people?

The number of ridiculous paradoxes in our economy shows clearly that it is redirection, rather than reduced speed which is required. The construction industry is forced to slow down because of manpower shortages, but the civil service grows by leaps and bounds to meet the needs of the new welfare state measures.

We are urged to buy Canada back from the United States, but the provisions of the Bank Act make it necessary for industry to turn to the U.S. for the kind of risk

capital it needs. Canadians invest in the national debt because the return is higher and more secure than investing in resource development. Exports are necessary to improve our balance of payments situation, but tight money policies and taxation combine to put the producer in a non-competitive position. The need today is not to slow down production--rather it is to step up and facilitate the distribution of what we can produce.

An economist commented recently, "We are learning to live with prosperity, but we don't know as much about managing it as we do about getting there."

Our need in Canada is not to hold back, but to move ahead. The distribution of goods and services is a field in which we are just beginning to tap our potential. Smugly we pat ourselves on the back for being good businessmen as we rationalize our trade deficits and slow down our production. The disposing of surplus is a narrow and old fashioned way of assessing our tremendous production potential. What about the many other countries which do not have enough to eat? What about the vast and continuing world markets for both primary and secondary products? The time has come to institute policies which go beyond the mere sale of surplus commodities and pioneer in the field of world-wide distribution of goods from wherever they are produced to wherever they are needed. World trade and a new basis for international settlements are the greatest challenges of our generation.

When all Canadians are gainfully employed, adequately housed and properly fed; when trading policies are developed which channel all our surplus goods and technical knowledge into the needy markets of the developing world, then we may talk about putting on the economic brakes. In the meantime, there are too many things which need doing.

CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party

April 21, 1966

TIME FOR A NEW BROADCASTING POLICY

The current furore over the firing of Messrs. Watson and LaPierre by the CBC is just one more indication that a thorough revision of broadcasting policy is long overdue. When the Hon. Judy LaMarsh, Secretary of State, said the present controversy was the top of an iceberg, symbolic of more serious problems in the CBC, she was repeating what is common knowledge to anyone interested in the affairs of the public broadcasting corporation.

Parliament was justified in rejecting the proposal to debate the "Seven Days" crisis and in insisting that the matter be handled by the standing committee on broadcasting. There is little to be gained by chipping at the top of the iceberg and leaving the submerged mass intact.

The CBC has become a top-heavy, bureaucratic structure in which empire building is allowed to go unchecked, in which businesslike management practices are neglected, and in which the public fails to have any effective voice. The evidence over the years to support this contention is too massive to detail here.

Much of the blame must be placed on the doorstep of the government for its failure to establish a policy that gives the CBC clear terms of reference, and for its failure to provide the means by which the CBC would be more directly responsible to the public and its representatives in Parliament.

There will be those who will argue that to give the public a stronger voice in the running of the CBC would eliminate the freedom of the producers in providing the controversial shows which have won international acclaim. That may well be true, but it is a breach of the very basis of democracy to ask the public to finance a

corporation which does not abide by its wishes. It is not the controversial programs that have aroused public opinion so much as the attitude on the part of the company that it did not have to pay any attention to public opinion.

Further aggravating the situation is the delay in setting up a special committee on Broadcasting in order that the Fowler Commission Report could be fully considered. Beyond this is the persistent rumour that none of the Fowler Report recommendations will be acted upon.

Radio and television broadcasting combine to become a most powerful voice in the moulding of public opinion and determining the culture of a nation. So powerful is this voice that it greatly influences at times the work and decision of Parliament. Clear guidelines need to be established and applied to both public and private broadcasting. With the impact of United States networks on Canadian listeners and viewers, the primary role of public broadcasting should be to reach those areas of the country that cannot be served economically by private broadcasting; and to ensure that all broadcasting media carry programs of quality that stress those things which will strengthen the unity and cultural heritage of Canada.

Ours is basically a free enterprise society, and the taxpayer should not be asked to finance a public body that competes unfairly with private corporations for advertising revenue.

Three things are needed to make public broadcasting the servant-- as it is meant to be--of the nation:

1. An effective means of channeling public opinion into the actual management programming of the CBC -
2. A tighter control of the purse strings to enforce operation along efficient business lines without undue infringement on the rights of private broadcasting -
3. A clear framework of principles and policies within which the management of the CBC builds and develops its vital role.

CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party.

September 14, 1966

PROSPERITY OR DEPRESSION - BOOM or BUST

Canadians are being told the Nation is threatened with the words "Inflationary Spiral Trend." The rising cost of consumer goods, increased transportation charges and the upward trend of taxation, all combined with the tight money situation, sound the bells of economic crisis.

It would seem to me we are intent on only diagnosing the symptoms of the disease and not considering its source. The basic cause of the economic sickness that is presently upon us seems to be completely ignored; and because of the uncertainty which is evident within the economy today, and the prospect of a "bust" following the present "boom" we could very easily tip over into a depression which could make the hungry thirties look like a picnic.

The real cause of the inflationary situation is the increased cost of everything we buy, and the reason behind this is the continued policy of debt and taxation. Those who live on fixed incomes, those who are unable to do anything about increasing their earnings such as pensioners and others are the real sufferers from this difficult situation.

"Why", I often ask, "should there be a continuous boom and bust cycle in our economy, with the tremendous resources we have at our disposal, with our ability and our knowledge, our capacity to consume at home - and the markets of the world reaching out to us?"

With a different fiscal policy and with a logical monetary policy - the two cannot be separated - there is absolutely no need for the boom or bust cycle of the present orthodox economic policies which we have had since long before World War 1. If we had a will to do so, we could increase the productive capacity of this country by 50% inside two years and we would not have to worry about where we would get either the resources or the manpower to do it. We have by no means reached the productive capacity of Canada: if the truth were known, we have barely touched the fringe of it.

In a world that is starving, and that cannot find enough to meet the needs of its people, the great challenge which faces Canada is to move out and become not only the breadbasket of the world, but the source of know-how to help other countries increase their own food production. This is Canada's challenge - this is Canada's world mission.

We are being told that Canada now faces an anticipated deficit of \$300 million - a very frightening amount indeed; and again I ask "Why is it necessary to have this deficit financing?" It seems to me the first step which should be taken is to have the budget balanced each year. This country operates on a debt policy which requires deficit financing on the one hand, and gross indebtedness on the private sector on the other hand, supported by a continually spiralling increase in the tax load which we carry.

Our budget this year at the federal level is over 8.5 billion and with the supplementary estimates may well reach \$10 billion. Add to this the municipal and provincial figures and we are reaching for

the \$20 billion mark.

Should we not ask ourselves - "Are we going to continue as we have done in the past and are presently doing?" I say as Canadians we must not in the face of the greatest challenge of our generation. I would further say it is only when all Canadians have an adequate standard of living, only when all Canadians are properly housed and fed, that we dare assert we are doing our best. Only when trading policies are underway which are capable of channeling our surplus goods to the needy populations of the developing countries, will we be able to congratulate ourselves on our achievements.

This is not the time to talk of a "bust" in the economy of our country - nor is it a time for slackening our effort - we have the potential for greatness in our grasp - Let us not fumble the ball!

CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party.

September 21, 1966

THE INFLATION OF GOVERNMENTS -

The controversy over current inflationary trends continues, and all the while the cost of living goes steadily upwards. Mr. Hart, President of the Bank of Montreal, has added his voice to the chorus of commentators, when he charged that "political expediency, marked by an unseemly bidding for votes, is responsible for the reluctance of Governments in Canada to cut their spending and help curb inflationary pressures." "We seem to have reached a stage in our affairs when the accepted, normal and necessary phenomenon of competition for electoral support has been transformed into an unseemly auction of favours" he continued. These are true words-- words which would have been even more significant had Mr. Hart included in his comments a discussion of the effects on the economy of a debt system which through governmental monetary and banking policies, demand that the debt load of governments continue, to the tune that last year interest charges cost the government of Canada approximately 15% of their budgets, a total sum exceeding \$3 billions. This is quite apart from corporate, mortgage or personal debt charges.

Finance Minister Sharp has issued a call to slow down the boom. In other words he asks for a reverse direction of the upward spiral, into the familiar pattern that bust must follow boom. If Mr. Sharp really intended to restrict expansion why didn't he hold government expenditure down? Federal Government expenditure this year is now up 10% over last year, and with supplementary expenditures still to come the increase will approximate 20% before the end of the fiscal year.

No wonder the cost of living goes up and up - there is no place else for it to go under such policies, because every increase in taxation, which supplies the

money for governmental expenditures, enters into the cost of every item the consumer buys. It is the taxpayer who pays in both cases.

Statistics just published show that municipal governments are increasing their expenditures even faster than the Federal Government. Municipalities in 1965 accounted for 42.7% of all Government spending in Canada, compared with 23.3% for the Provinces and 34% for Ottawa. The grand totals for 1965 show that Municipal governments spent \$9½ billions, Provincial Governments over \$5 billions and the Federal Government over \$7 3/4 billions. The total is the awesome figure of over \$22 billions, approximately 50% of the net earnings of the Canadian people.

The expenditure increases for 1966 will give Canada a Centennial Governmental Expenditure of some \$25 billions. It is a heavy load for taxpayers of Canada, who as consumers also foot the bill for the cost-of-living increase.

The Economic Council of Canada states that a stable economy requires that wage and price increases must not exceed the average growth rate of the nation's productivity, which last year in Canada was less than 4% net. The danger light is flashing RED!

The President of the Bank of Montreal is right. Governmental expenditure and growth must be restricted. Big Government - getting bigger - must hold the line. Politicians must provide financial and monetary policies which will meet the needs of the taxpayer and the consumer.

Mr. Sharp - there is no other way!

CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party

September 28, 1966

NATIONAL THANKSGIVING

This week some two hundred delegates are meeting on Parliament Hill. They have come from the four corners of the earth to attend the 12th General Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference.

The flowers on the Hill are still untouched by frost--the grass a beautiful carpet of green--the flags of the Commonwealth Nations fluttering in a majestic row before the main entrance of the House of Commons--the chimes from the Peace Tower ringing out a welcome as the delegates gathered for the opening ceremonies--a perfect picture of beauty--of peace and well-being--to the casual observer on this beautiful autumn day.

Senator Connolly in his remarks as Conference Chairman said in part--
"I can think of no better way of improving Commonwealth relations than to bring together lawmakers from the many parliaments and legislatures of the Commonwealth for a few days of honest and frank discussion on current problems...and, if the peoples of the Commonwealth are truly to develop common aspirations, notwithstanding the great distances between them, nor differences of race and creed, and of political and economic circumstances, it is imperative that their chosen representatives meet periodically to share their particular experience and examine outstanding issues of mutual interest....."

These delegates have come from New Zealand, Australia, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Malaysia, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Kenya, Maawi and all the other Commonwealth countries. For two weeks they have been visiting Canada from coast to coast, observing first-hand how we as Canadians

live. How interesting it would be if we could have, say, the delegate from Sarawak, Perak, or one of the other more familiar countries, striving to help their people to a better way of life, give us his thinking on what he saw of Canada and Canadians during this two-week tour. They saw our beautiful cities, our miles of modern highways, our fabulous resource and industrial wealth, all the things which are ours to enjoy and many must have said within themselves "If only our people had all of these blessings to enjoy."

Now the Conference is down to business--and it will not be all smooth sailing. It is the duty and task of each representative present to work diligently for that which will be for the good of his country. Many feel they must work for an immediate good--their people often are not willing to wait for an ultimate good. It seems in this jet age people want their benefits now right in their waiting hands, and by and large they want them with a "me and mine" outlook. I hasten to say I am not implying at all that this is the prevailing spirit of the 12th Commonwealth Conference. There will be many here whose sole desire and purpose is to bring about that which will be for the benefit of the Commonwealth as a whole, and strengthen our ties, before the Conference closes and the delegates turn their faces homeward.

These men will go back to their respective countries, taking with them the report of the Conference, their thinking on Canada as a nation, and on those of us whom they met while here. They will no doubt tell of their trip across our country--the rich harvest fields--the great industries--the schools, the hospitals, the homes--they will also tell of strikes--of unrest--which is also part of our Canadian life. We too are very aware of the good and the bad features

which surround us, and it should be the aim of all of us to work toward rectifying those conditions which could and should be bettered.

Another Thanksgiving Season is upon us--let us each take time out to sum up those things which should go toward making us a thankful people. To do this we need only compare our lot with that of the homeland of too many of our Commonwealth neighbours who are presently with us. Canada has set aside a day for National Thanksgiving and what is Thanksgiving? Let me again give you my dictionary definition which I gave you last year--it bears repeating--"Thanksgiving is an act of expressing gratitude for favours and mercies--a public acknowledgement and celebration of Divine goodness, in which we as a country acknowledge the blessings received from God." May we as Canadians do this very act--and make it a time of thanksgiving in our hearts from sea to sea and from the rivers to the ends of the earth.

CANDID COMMENT

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party,

October 5, 1966

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The forced delay in the implementation of the Government's Medicare programme points on the one hand to a major policy rift within the ranks of the Liberal Party; but more significantly it points to the danger threatening the Canadian economy by excessive expenditures of public funds by government for direct welfare costs. Beyond this is a developing situation made critical by these welfare expenditures going to certain areas of need at the neglect of others. The real problems of Medicare concern not only costs, but also the fact that there are not sufficient doctors and nurses being trained to meet the needs of a State Medicare System.

If we are to prevent ourselves from being completely engulfed within an all-embracing socialistic welfare state, we must in Canada reestablish the ancient virtues of courage, honesty, thrift and industry in the minds and hearts of the people. This would be an almost complete reversal of the present tendency. The worldwide destructive trend abroad today panders to mediocrity, and can only result in drying up fountains and springs out of which our economic progress and high productivity are developed.

We must go back to giving quality to the job and again take up the codes and standards of excellence which contributed so much to the founding of this country. But how? What can be done to revive such a sense of responsibility?

If we are ever to get back on the right track again, we must set our goal the rekindling of proper enthusiasm for the virtues of self-reliance and self-help

This rekindling must start early - I would suggest at the Parents' knee, also in the earliest formative years of education in our schools; and to be truly effective it must be pursued with dogged determination till once again it will become fashionable to give a full day's work for a full day's pay. I am convinced that nothing gives greater inner satisfaction to men and women than knowing they have contributed to the national heap of goods and services as much as they have received

We must have responsible government as well as responsible individuals - a government responsible to the voters - not an all-powerful master of the people but a capable servant, interested in the good of the individual.

In every department of our country's life, labour, business, agriculture, in spiritual and secular spheres, leaders must champion, encourage, develop and maintain a sound basic system of responsible private enterprise. Throughout history the story of human progress is that of leadership by serviceable men; of men who started things and inspired confidence in others to carry on with them, whether it be financially, morally, physically or spiritually.

The professional radicals claim that capitalism is a selfish system - that within its framework a greedy few exploit the helpless many. Doubtless there are a few such in every age, but we may also ask, "What of the racketeers and criminals in the labour movement?" There is of course a vast difference between the "honest" and the "professional" radical. To the honest radical a social program is more than a piece of machinery. He is really not a politician, a propagandist nor an opportunist. I do fear, however, that he is fast disappearing, and over against this fact, we see professional radicals growing in frightening numbers. These for reasons of their own expediency, are promoting

government's power and bigness; knowing full well that oppressive taxation and the harrassment of individual enterprise, which are marks of big government, will lead inevitably to socialism.

It is natural for the individual to want the right to choose the work, trade or profession he prefers, and to enjoy the reward of his efforts. Responsible government recognizes that people should be encouraged to invest to make a profit, for the profit earner is a contributor to national welfare. Reasonable profits should be applauded, not frowned on. The real crime is in losses, not profits, as claimed by those who support the so-called virtues of the welfare state.

CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party

October 19, 1966

CANADA - MONARCHY or REPUBLIC?

Is there an organized plot to push Canada into the status of a Republic?

Do the many minor changes being implemented through departmental decisions, indicate that through sneak-thief gradualism it is the planned policy of the present Government to "liberate" Canada from its present constitutional status of a democratic monarchy via the back door. Not only does it concern the almost casual announcement on October 13 by a minor post office official that Canada's coat of arms and the words "Royal Mail" were to be replaced by a 14 point maple leaf on mail trucks and bags but also the deletion of the Coat of Arms from the front page of the Labour Gazette and other official publications. The disappearance of "God save The Queen" from most social and sport functions in Ottawa and elsewhere is something of which many of us are aware.

The Government of Canada considered it necessary to consult the Provinces before inviting the Queen of Canada to attend the Centennial celebrations! The only logical conclusion that can be drawn from these and many other actions, minor in detail, but major in cumulative effect, is that it is the determined intention of some unseen force, hiding from public identity, that Canada in the near future be transformed into a republic.

This raises the question whether there is any constitutional authority for such action apart from direct parliamentary decision. I do not think there is; neither does Dr. Eugene Forsey, who is one of the most respected constitutional authorities in Canada. Writing in the Toronto Telegram Dr. Forsey ably stated

that --

"For at least 60 years after Confederation, our mails were unmistakably, by repeated acts of the Parliament of Canada, "Her Majesty's" or "His Majesty's". And the fact that the terms do not now (as far as I can discover) appear in the Post Office Act does not in the least mean that they have become obsolete. If the mails are not, in law, "Her Majesty's", whose are they? The Postmaster General's? Mr. Pearson's?

Invite any constitutional lawyer to answer. No statute that I am aware of calls the Postmaster-General and his colleagues "Her Majesty's ministers"; but that is unquestionably what they are, in law, and what they must remain, unless and until, this country is formally, and legally, made into a republic.

The Postmaster-General says that the maple leaf is "an emblem which will represent a truly Canadian post office and which will give a real interpretation to the Post Office Act." What on earth does this mumbo-jumbo mean? What kind of post office have we had hitherto? German? French? English? Russian? The very first Post Office Act, in 1867, the same one that asserted firmly that our mails were "Her Majesty's" called our post office "the Canada post office" and "Her Majesty's Canada post office." As for the real interpretation: since what is being taken off the trucks in mail bags is the coat-of-arms of Canada, what is being ditched is not merely the symbol of our historic monarchy, the monarchy which the Fathers of Confederation unanimously, deliberately, chose to preserve, but a historic symbol of Canada itself, embodying (as no merely vegetable emblem can) our historic past, French and English.

Perhaps, then, its removal means that we are being softened up not only for sly, gumshoe, undercover change to a republic, without argument, without discussion, without any decision by Parliament or the people, but also for an equally sly, gumshoe, undercover change to Associate States, or to a counterfeit Canada a la Daniel Johnson, in which Quebec would have made itself for most purposes a foreign country, but would still retain its ministers, senators and members of the Commons in Ottawa, with full power to share in making decisions which would affect only the other nine provinces. If so, I can suggest a more appropriate emblem than the maple leaf to put on the trucks, the mail bags, and anything else the Government contemplates defacing: two jackasses eating the leaves off one maple tree."

I agree further with Dr. Forsey that --

"Anybody, in or out of the Government, has a right to argue for a republic, or two republics, or one and a half. Anyone, in or out of the Government, has a right to campaign for any such change. No one, in or out of the Government, has any business altering the Constitution of Canada by gradually sneaking us into a fundamental change on which we have never had a chance to pronounce."

What do Canadians think about this situation? Is the Queen of Canada to be relegated to the same place as our Colonial past? IT IS TIME TO STAND UP AND BE COUNTED.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party.

November 2, 1966

CANADA'S INDIANS

It is high time Canada stopped destroying its original citizens with welfare charity. With only a handful of days till this Nation's 100th birthday, Canadians still must blush with embarrassment, and look aside when faced with the question: "What have you done for your native Indians?". Red-faced we should be, for probably no single national problem has been given the political football treatment more than this has. Policy makers over the decades have offered grandiose plans and schemes to solve the problem but all have failed. No better example of such projects can be had than at Fort Chipewyan, Alberta. The 1965 budget of the Federal Department of Indian Affairs exceeded 2 million dollars for this community of some 1400 people. This is a per capita expenditure of well over \$1,400. This covered the areas of welfare, education, health, police, forestry, parks and D.O.T. The total income to the government for this community through royalties and different forms of tax was less than 10% of this amount. The earned income, other than for those directly employed by the Government was negligible. In another area on three small reserves, with a total population of less than 700 Indians, the Federal Government spent in 1965 some \$287,000, in addition to pensions, family allowance and treaty money. Not one family living on these three reserves is self-supporting. The total taxes collected in a nearby town of less than 3000 people for the same period was \$165,000.

How have we failed? Through bureaucratic agencies, pecuniary assistance and outright handouts, we have suppressed desire and initiative, and have robbed our native Indian brothers of democracy.

Canada's Indians were once proud people. The records of the early Europeans, explorer, fur trader and settler indicate that they were highly organized; knew what they wanted and how to get it, with a well-developed system of tribal government. Unfortunately, over the decades, their desires, ambitions, their morals and racial community pride have been eroded. Afraid of losing the monthly

handout, robbed of his natural rights, thwarted by governmental red tape and suppressed by government agencies, Canada's Indians now hold the dubious distinction of being this nation's second-class citizens.

Traditionally and by statute, Canada's treaty Indians have not been a federal government responsibility. Fortunately certain provincial governments in Western Canada have taken up the challenge. In fairness, it must be stated that, to this point, the Federal Government has gone along with these provinces, and has not road-blocked the current moves afoot.

In Alberta and Manitoba a group of dedicated men called Community Development Officers have succeeded in winning the confidence of a few provincial policy-makers. They have skirted red tape and have gone directly to the Indian people. Their first steps include education. No--they don't build schools and they do not force Indian children to attend classes. They do, however, through group discussions and personal contact, encourage as many Indian leaders as possible to inspect educational facilities, to see for themselves what can be achieved through honest effort.

Community Development officers strongly caution against taking shortcuts and endeavouring to lead. They believe it is a fallacy that Indian people don't want and don't appreciate a better life with modern comforts for their families and people. They believe, however, that the Indians must take the initiative to organize and seek what is rightfully theirs, --as it is ours - the right to democracy.

Community Development officers are no longer just working with theories. They can now proudly cite several examples of the success of their approach to the problem. In one northern Alberta Indian community the crime rate dropped from 62 court cases in one month to two cases in a period of six months. Still another, community demanded the opportunity to set up and operate a logging mill. This community now enjoys almost total employment, with the Indian people directing the mill's operation. It would appear that the officers of this organization have won a point.

Let us do our part too, and stop selling our Indian brother short. We must go to him, speak to him and encourage him to reclaim his rightful heritage: comfort for his family and an opportunity to fulfil his desires.

Canadians will once again be able to hold their heads high without embarrassment when they stop sending conscience money to the reserves, and when they acquire a genuine interest in, not sympathy for Canada's first citizens.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party.

November 9, 1966

PIPELINE or PIPEDREAM?

There is no question in my mind that Canada must find and maintain an adequate and stable market for its surplus natural resources. There is no better case in point than this country's vast and growing surplus of natural gas.

The Conservation Board has established that with proper incentives the reserves of natural gas in Alberta alone will continue to grow at the average rate of between 2 and 4 trillion cubic feet per year for the next 15 to 20 years and that some 50 trillion cubic feet of new reserves will be discovered during the period from 1959 to 1988. Of this 50 trillion it is estimated that 44 trillion will be surplus to Alberta's needs for the next 30 years and surplus to Canada's needs for at least the next 25 years.

It is more than logical to assume that, if Canada's 2 billion dollar a year wheat industry is heavily dependent on the hunger of communist nations, are we not more than justified in establishing a greater market for our surplus gas with our friendly neighbour to the south?

Canada, if it is to enjoy a projected destiny of growth and expansion, must establish and maintain a healthy trade balance. There is no question that the experts consider Canada to have more than sufficient natural gas to take care of its present and future needs for many years to come. There can be no better time than now to correct the chronic imbalance of trade which currently exists between this country and the United States; an imbalance that will, this year, hit more than a billion dollars.

As thinking Canadians we cannot oppose current plans to augment facilities for the handling of our natural gas. The National Energy Board has approved the building of a second gas pipeline route around the southern part of the great lakes to facilitate the exporting of natural gas to the U.S. and to increase transmission to eastern Canada. The basic opposition to the new pipeline centres on pseudo nationalistic and economic premises. The proposed bill has

has penalties and requirements which go even beyond guarantees for the nations best interest to the extent of being almost redundant: Canada will control the gas that enters and leaves this pipeline and, by agreement, the northern pipeline through Canada will remain this country's main transmission line to eastern markets. There can be no doubt that northern Ontario and eastern Canada will have their needs met, even to the extent of the building of a second all-Canadian pipeline.

It is a paradox that those in Canada who oppose this proposition sing the same tune as the powerful oil interests in Texas and Oklahoma who likewise do not want Canadian gas reaching the U.S. markets. They make strange bed-fellows.

We cannot ignore the savings in dollars and cents the new pipeline route offers to eastern Canada. We can not ignore the opportunity to help alleviate our trade imbalance. Likewise, it is only good economics to not only increase the sale of our natural gas, but to increase our oil sales to the U.S. through a proposed new oil pipeline to Chicago. Lower transmission costs, additional benefits through earned international exchange and added impetus to gas exploration and development are key factors in our consideration of the proposed new gas transmission line.

Yes, the whole question of Canada's efforts to augment its gas exports and facilitate a more economical transportation of its natural gas to eastern Canada could, if defeated, go down in history as the 'pipedream of 1966'; the pipedream that, had it become a reality, would have been a pipeline to prosperity and progress. The question is in your hands and mine:

"PIPELINE or PIPEDREAM?"

N E W S F L A S H

BOB THOMPSON, YOUR MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, ON TV

"CANADA 100 YEARS LATER"

1. I will be on CKRD TV every Sunday at 4:00 P.M. When I am in Red Deer, the programme will be a report of events in Parliament. When I cannot be home, the programme will be illustrated with pictures of some important aspect of Canadian life.

Nov. 13 - NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Nov. 20 - CANADA AT CENTENNIAL

Nov. 27 - EVENTS IN PARLIAMENT (Personal Report)

Dec. 4 - ILLUSTRATED "VISIT TO PARLIAMENT"

Dec. 11 - PERSONAL REPORT

2. Red Deer Federal Constituency Association Annual Meeting -
8:00 P.M. - November 26 - Parklander Motel.
Executive and Council Meeting - 6:00 P.M. - Parklander Motel.
3. "CANDID COMMENTS" which is published in several weeklies across Canada each week, will be sent to you on a regular basis.

P.S. - This is being mailed to you just as I am leaving for Germany and France as one of the Canadian delegates to the annual meeting of NATO. This is a two week assignment, especially important because of the "opting out" policies of General deGaulle.

CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party.

November 23, 1966.

DEFENCE

Securing the boundaries of any country against attack is a vital question. Each nation has a right to protect its lawful territory and its people. Having agreed to this each nation must then decide on the most effective and efficient means of protection against any aggressor.

No one can deny that Canada's defence minister has taken a bold and courageous step in calling for the eventual unification of this country's three military services. It takes boldness to face head-on the challenge of such a major undertaking and courage to meet the inevitable criticism. By human nature man resists change, but, as it should be, man must thoroughly investigate and question what he does not understand. There were many questions and numerous doubts about the Wright brothers and their plans to fly like the birds. Today, men circle the globe in outer space and the story barely makes front page news.

Well, so much for that. The question must be: Is Paul Hellyer right? First we must be realistic and consider two major factors: (1) Canada is and intends to remain a non-aggressor nation, and (2) Canada's geographical factors and small population make sustained effective defence impossible without the aid of other nations. In other words the defence precautions necessary for this country are a shared responsibility with her neighbours and friends. Through private and government study some three years ago it became obvious that there were many areas of duplication (Canada can't really afford the expensive luxury of three air forces which she presently has. These are the Naval Air Arm, the Army Air Section and the R. C. A. F.); and, ironical as it may seem, army, navy and air

force were each planning for different types of defensive war at the same time. Good old "you know who" just wasn't getting the best value for his tax dollar.

No one blamed the men and women in the three services. Canada's military record is well documented in history and there was never any question about the superb calibre of our people in the armed services. As investigation continued the picture became clearer and there appeared but one logical answer: integration and the eventual unification of Canada's three military forces.

It is my belief that unification is the ultimate answer to Canada's defence needs both in fulfilling its role at home and in maintaining its international arrangements with NATO and NORAD and its peace-keeping commitments. No one has suggested that curing Canada's defence ills would be easy, but it had to be done.

One of the strong arguments winning support for unification is the prospect of cutting costs. There are several who argue that this will not be the case. The 1964 white paper on defence estimated the cost of maintaining a properly equipped unified force at something over 1.56 billion dollars a year. Others now claim this figure should be augmented by another billion. Experts in the forces suggest that 125 thousand men in uniform are required to fulfil the white paper's promises. In June of this year the total in uniform stood at 105 thousand. A recent study now contends that this figure could drop to 90 thousand by 1972.

The Minister has been accused of having no feeling for tradition. No one can deny that the deep traditions of the navy, make it very difficult for naval personnel to don army uniforms and ranks. It hardly seems reasonable or necessary to rename an admiral a general. However, when tradition overshadows effectiveness, someone has to draw the line. The place of the line drawn by Mr. Hellyer is and should be open to question. During a recent tour of Canadian NATO bases

in Germany and France it was evident that Canadian forces servicemen were overwhelmingly in favour of integration, particularly through the ranks and junior officer personnel.

Whatever the merits or demerits of unification might be, Canada's military people are well received the world over. A senior naval officer, following a tour of NATO bases in Germany and France and of peace-keeping forces in Cyprus, informed me that the most impressive fact about our Canadian forces personnel overseas is the extremely high morale and dedication to mission.

Canadians have long urged their government to stand up and be counted in world affairs. Canada's Government has taken a bold and courageous stand in the field of defence. The unification plan could well be the mould by which other nations will shape their defence policies. WHERE DO YOU STAND?

Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader,
Social Credit Party.

November 30, 1966.

THE CBC - TUNED IN OR OFF THE BEAM?

Never in recent years has a subject raised such strong public reaction as has the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's television programming, and rightly it should. Following the last several "Sunday" programmes, Members of Parliament have been flooded with phone calls, letters and telegrams all urging action to clean up the CBC. The answer given by Secretary of State, Judy LaMarsh, in the House of Commons in reply to questions regarding the "Sunday" programme was typical of that given by the Government, that all direct responsibility for the CBC was denied. The Secretary of State said that the management of CBC had freedom to produce its programmes "within the dictates of good taste", and that the Government could not interfere. One wonders whose taste is being satisfied.

The CBC has deviated so far from truly reflecting the Canadian way of life that one wonders whether the corporation has a right to bear the title of "Canadian", particularly when it is considered by many to be the Voice of Canada. It would almost seem that certain elements within the CBC have been testing the Canadian people with their off-beat programmes in an effort to determine just how far they could go before the public would cry stop! When the intimacies of sex are debased in a television film sequence, surely it is high time for the public to speak out.

Canadians are now paying the CBC piper an annual subsidy of 107-million dollars. Is it not only fair to expect that we who are paying the piper should be allowed to call the tune? Can you imagine what the reactions of a large company's shareholders would be if the board of directors ignored the shareholders' wishes. It is quite certain, if the CBC is to be responsible to the public, the public will have to be responsible for the CBC. Canadians can no longer tolerate having flagrant pornography, anti-moral propaganda and divisive presentations thrust down their throats and the throats of their children. We have a right to expect from the CBC - public corporation that it is - programmes that are as healthy as the water from our taps.

Something should be done and can about the garbage and depravity that comes bursting into our living rooms. It is my suggestion that the Board of Broadcast Governors be reorganized and set up on a full-time basis, but more important there should also be an advisory council on broadcasting truly representative of a wide spectrum of Canadian thinking. This council could be composed of 60 members including a representative of each Provincial Government, ten members of the Federal Parliament and 40 representatives from the democratically-formed associations of labour, agriculture, home and school, civic and service clubs, the professions and the arts and from the churches. This advisory council would be charged with the responsibility of laying down guiding principles of policy and programming for the CBC and private networks and stations, both radio and TV. With these changes, broadcasting in this country would more accurately reflect the Canadian society.

Broadcasting is a powerful medium. Probably no one realized how powerful it could be more than did Hitler. But like atomic energy, it can be used for life or destruction.

It must be thoroughly understood that the airwaves are not the private property of any individual or group, but belong to us all. By this axiom the content of CBC programming must be directed by the Canadian public. I strongly believe that politics must be kept out of broadcasting. When, however, the Government invests huge sums of our money in a crown corporation and lets it become totally independent of Parliament, the Government has abdicated its public trust. Politics can be kept out of broadcasting by employing the co-operative principles outlined; then with Parliament and a representative body of the Canadian society working hand-in-hand, broadcasting will once more use its power for the good of us all.

Yes, it's high time that the CBC was tuned-in to the thinking of the country and got back on the beam of responsible broadcasting.

Rendezvous With You

By Foster M. Russell

As an editor we've entertained a respect for Robert N. Thompson, M.P., National Leader, Social Credit Party. We met Mr. Thompson last year after an address he made at Port Hope United Church, and our respect grew for this man.

Bob Thompson is not a scintillating Diefenbaker, a stumbling Pearson, an erratic Caouette, a wordy Tommy Douglas — he is a sincere Canadian striving to make our country a better place in which to live and work.

Each week, Mr. Thompson's "Candid Comments" are issued from Ottawa to Canadian media — the Candid Comment of last week is of special value to every Canadian. Here it is:

"The forced delay in the implementation of the Government's Medicare program points on the one hand to a major policy rift within the ranks of the Liberal Party; but more significantly it points to the danger threatening the Canadian economy by excessive expenditures of public funds by government for direct welfare costs.

"Beyond this is a developing situation made critical by these welfare expenditures going to certain areas of need at the neglect of others.

"The real problems of Medicare concern not only costs, but also the fact that there are not sufficient doctors and nurses being trained to meet the needs of a State Medicare System.

"If we are to prevent ourselves from being completely engulfed within an all-embracing socialistic welfare state, we must in Canada re-establish the ancient virtues of courage, honesty, thrift and industry in the minds and hearts of the people.

"This would be an almost

complete reversal of the present tendency. The worldwide destructive trend abroad today panders to mediocrity, and can only result in drying up fountains and springs out of which our economic progress and high productivity are developed.

"We must go back to giving quality to the job and again take up the codes and standards of excellence which contributed so much to the founding of this country. But how? What can be done to revive such a sense of responsibility?

"If we are ever to get back on the right track again, we must set our goal, the rekindling of proper enthusiasm for the virtues of self-reliance and self-help. This rekindling must start early — I would suggest at the Parents' knee, also in the earliest formative years of education in our schools; and to be truly effective it must be pursued with dogged determination till once again it will become fashionable to give a full day's work for a full day's pay. I am convinced that nothing gives greater inner satisfaction to men and women than knowing they have contributed to the national heap of goods and services as much as they have received.

"We must have responsible government as well as responsible individuals — a government responsible to the voters — not an all-powerful master of the people but a capable servant, interested in the good of the individual.

"In every department of our country's life, labor, business, agriculture, in spiritual and secular spheres, leaders must champion, encourage, develop and maintain a sound basic system of responsible private enterprise. Through-

out history the story of human progress is that of leadership by serviceable men; of men who started things and inspired confidence in others to carry on with them, whether it be financially, morally, physically or spiritually.

"The professional radicals claim that capitalism is a selfish system — that within its framework a greedy few exploit the helpless many. Doubtless there are a few such in every age, but we may also ask, 'What of the racketeers and criminals in the labor movement?'

"There is of course, a vast difference between the 'honest' and the 'professional' radical. To the honest radical a social program is more than a place of machinery. He is really not a politician, a propagandist nor an opportunist. I do fear, however, that he is fast disappearing, and over against this fact, we see professional radicals growing in frightening numbers. These for reasons of their own expediency, are promoting government's power and bigness; knowing full well that oppressive taxation and the harassment of individual enterprise, which are marks of big government, will lead inevitably to socialism.

"It is natural for the individual to want the right to choose the work, trade or profession he prefers, and to enjoy the reward of his efforts. Responsible government recognizes that people should be encouraged to invest to make a profit, for the profit earner is a contributor to national welfare. Reasonable profits should be applauded, not frowned on. The real crime is in losses, not profits, as claimed by those who support the so-called virtues of the welfare state."



House of Commons Debates

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE POSSIBLE REMOVAL OF COAT OF ARMS

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied, nor do I think the Canadian people will be satisfied with the statement which the Postmaster General has made in the house this afternoon. As I see it, the real problem is that the statement made by the Postmaster General on October 14, in answer to this question, was a direct statement of proposed action, and I do not think the remarks made this afternoon are consistent with that, nor do they adequately deal with the situation. Hon. members will find Mr. Speaker, on examining what was said today that today's remarks are far different from what was said on previous days in answer to this question. It remains a fact that on October 13 a minor post office official stated almost casually that Canada's coat of arms and the words "Royal Mail" would be progressively removed from post from post office trucks and mail bags.

That statement caused all the discussion and uproar, and it is more than just an uproar, in the house this afternoon. As I see it, what is happening here is a determined and planned attempt to try to erase the tradition and history of this country. Let me ask this question of the Postmaster General and anyone else in this house who thinks that the question is legitimate: What is wrong with the Canadian coat of arms?

To say that Canada's coat of arms must be equated with an insignia on an aircraft or a hat or the flag or any other symbol that represents Canada at home or abroad is wrong. The coat of arms is entirely different. The coat of arms belongs to all of us. It represents part of our history and part of our legitimate tradition. It is the official

Reports From Ottawa



emblem and seal of Canada and the government of Canada. It represents the nation of Canada. We should not confuse symbols and the coat of arms because they are entirely different.

It seems to me that many minor changes are being brought about which may be minor in detail but major in cumulative effect. What is happening here in my opinion is an intentional moving of Canada toward republican status.

Whether we admit it or not that is the impression the Canadian people get and that is the impression I get.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD COST OF INSURED MEDICAL CARE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen for the second reading of Bill No. C-227, to authorize the payment of contributions by Canada toward the cost of insured medical care services incurred by provinces pursuant to provincial medical care insurance plans.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that this debate has carried on for a considerable length of time. I have not participated in it except at the resolution stage, and I have only a few brief remarks to make at this time.

In the debate we have often heard this bill referred to as a medicare bill. As I understand it, in no way can this legislation be termed as such, nor is it claimed to be such by the minister. It is an act to authorize the payment of contributions by the federal government to the provinces, to ensure services, amounting to approximately half the cost of medical practitioners' fees.

We are dealing with a very limited health insurance bill which we acknowledge is a step toward the medical health insurance which we all recognize must be available to all Canadians, according to their needs.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to re-emphasize once more that I am not against the principle of health insurance. For many years we in this party have advocated a system of health insurance that will make available to all Canadians adequate health care according to their needs, and not according to what might be their ability to pay. We are 100 per cent in support of the proposition that health care must be available to each citizen according to his need, regardless of his financial ability to pay.

What I disagree with, and this is the point I wish to develop briefly this evening, is the contention that it is the responsibility of the state to provide health insurance for everybody whether he wants it or not, whether he needs it or not. I do not see why it is necessary for government to assume the responsibility of providing health insurance for people who do not want it, for people who are perfectly able to take care of themselves and who want to take care of themselves. To impose the suggested type of health service on the Canadian people is to interfere seriously with the right of freedom of choice. This should in no way detract from our responsibility to assure that each citizen may have the best care when it is needed; and on that score comprehensive health insurance must be available for all Canadians.

Many speakers have justified their intention to vote for or against this bill on the ground that second reading merely represents a vote on the principle contained in the bill. If the principle were the provision by the federal government, in co-operation with provincial governments, of comprehensive health insurance, I would agree that that is a legitimate principle, and I could not help but be in support of it. In view of what this bill contains, and I must interpret its principle on that basis, I cannot agree with those who say they must give carte blanche acceptance to what they think is the principle.

I believe that on an issue such as this hon. members must vote according to their convictions, and I only wish all members of the house would do so. Certainly I know that within the ranks of the Liberal party there are many who have reservations about this bill, but are prevented by caucus discipline from expressing their personal convictions.

When he introduced the bill the minister laid stress on four fundamental points, and I wish to refer to them briefly because it is on the basis of some of them I find myself unable to accept the principle of the bill in

relation to what it actually contains. The minister very carefully attempted to argue that universal coverage should not be confused with compulsory coverage, but this is something with which I cannot agree, unless he can enlighten us with some further explanation. His explanation that universal coverage does not mean compulsory coverage was, to me, not much more than an exercise in semantics.

What could be more compulsory than a requirement that practically the entire population of a province must be covered in order for that province to qualify for the financial assistance provided by this proposed legislation? It outlines a figure of 90 per cent coverage, rising to 95 per cent, and I think the minister would be much wiser to lower that qualification in the initial years.

If he wishes to include the plans in existence in Alberta, B.C. and Ontario, with perhaps some minor adjustments to them, it would be much wiser if universal coverage were defined as 80 per cent of a province's population in the first year of operation, 85 per cent in the second year and 90 per cent in the third year. If the government retains this 90 per cent initial provision, then I am afraid this bill will bar from its operation three health schemes which are presently working well and which are acceptable to the majority of the people in three provinces.

The minister also outlined the position with respect to the provision relating to public carriers, and said that in order to be acceptable a provincial health insurance plan must be administered by a public body. There are many ways in which carriers can be transformed into public carriers, making them non-profit organizations and subject to public audit by provincial legislatures; but by this provision the minister is wiping out the multi-carriers and many private carriers who now function effectively. To impose this as a qualifying requirement seems unreasonable, and I cannot accept the principle involved. In the first case that I have mentioned there is involved the freedom of choice of the individual, and in the second case the right and responsibility of a province to develop its own health plan suitable to its own needs. I have sufficient confidence in our provincial administrations that I believe they are better able to determine what kind of health insurance scheme is suited to their province than is any federal government.

The minister made two other points, and I should like to comment on these briefly because I find myself in partial disagreement with them. The minister has said that this legislation is limited to paying half the cost of the services of physicians. I presume he means by this medical practitioners. He estimated that cost to be \$28 per capita, half of which is \$14. It seems to me that if this legislation really is intended to cover the cost of health care in so far as those who administer health care are concerned, then it would not be so confining as it is. Why does it not include dentists; why does it not include optometrists, chiropractors and osteopaths? These are licensing professions rendering health service. Certainly if we are to take care of the over-all health, as it relates to health services, we cannot separate the care of the eyes, the teeth, and the specialized care given by the chiropractors and osteopaths.

I think therefore this legislation is much too restrictive. It does not accomplish what it gives the impression it intends to accomplish. Certainly it should be more inclusive. . . . I expect this will be considered very carefully at the committee stage and that there will be amendments proposed in this regard to various clauses in the bill. At the present time I cannot agree to the bill in its limited form.

There is just one other point I should like to make. This refers to the fourth point made by the minister relating to the matter of portability. I agree that portability is absolutely essential if we are to have any kind of satisfactory health insurance scheme across the nation. However, with the three major provincial schemes, which are very similar, with another soon to be introduced, and with Quebec introducing a plan on its own, there can be portability. So far as the provincial governments are concerned, I am sure they want to accomplish and will accomplish this. Therefore it should be included, because unless there is portability we will be moving toward discrimination of another type.

I should like again to place on the record the fact that I am in favour of a national health insurance scheme which will guarantee to every Canadian the best health services that can be provided, regardless of ability to pay. However I cannot accept the principle of the bill unless in his closing statement the minister might be able to clear up some of these things. I hope that he will. I should like him to give assurance that when we reach

the committee stage the restrictive aspect of the bill so far as health practitioners are concerned will be changed, if it is the decision of the committee that it should be changed.

As the bill stands now however it is not possible for me to support it, having regard specifically to those principles which are enunciated in the bill itself. Again I am referring to the freedom of choice, first of all of the individual as to whether or not he wants a government health insurance plan; second, concerning which health service it will be; and third, freedom of action so that the various provinces can develop their own health insurance plans, which will reach the same objective as I am sure the minister has, in that we must have a health insurance scheme that will adequately meet the needs of the Canadian people.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING LOAN RATIO ON RENTAL HOUSING, LOANS ON EXISTING HOUSING, ETC.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the National Housing Act, 1954, to further encourage the demand for housing by increasing the loan ratio for rental housing from 85 per cent of the lending value to 90 per cent of the lending value; by providing that loans made to persons who intend to purchase, improve and occupy existing housing be insurable on conditions similar to loans made for new housing; by increasing from eight and one-half billion dollars to nine and one-half billion dollars the aggregate amount of all loans that may be insured under the Act; by increasing from three and one-quarter billion dollars to four billion dollars the maximum charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund for lending by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation; by authorizing the Corporation, with the approval of the government of the province concerned, to make loans for student housing projects which will not be restricted only to the accommodation of university students; by increasing from two hundred million dollars to three hundred and fifty million dollars the amount that may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund as loans for student housing projects or reimbursement for losses sustained on loans for such projects; and by extending for an additional three years the period within which the construction of a sewage treatment project in respect of which a loan has been or is to be made under Part VIB of the Act must be completed if the municipality or municipal sewerage corporation is to be forgiven payment of a part of the principal amount of the loan and of the accrued interest thereon.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Thompson: May I commend the minister on what he has outlined today in the resolution, if it represents all the amendments which are to be introduced following this discussion. While I believe the changes being introduced definitely are a move in the right direction and certainly provide a far better program than the incentive program, I am most concerned about the over-all picture of housing because I think the whole housing industry in the matter of construction of homes for Canadian people is rapidly falling behind the need. At the beginning I should like to make a few remarks in this regard before commenting on the resolution itself and the statement of the minister.

• (4:50 p.m.)

According to statistics available, there will be only about 140,000 new units built in Canada in 1966. It is estimated that this will be 110,000 short of the nation's need. This is a serious situation because it is easier to cut back than it is to begin a building program again.

It seems to be rather a paradox that, when we have such an abundance of building materials of every type one cares to mention and construction organizations, we are denied a sufficient number of homes because of a tight money policy. There is truly a crisis in the homebuilding industry and it is becoming more and more acute.

The minister said in his remarks today that the financial and economic policy of the government is directed toward warding off the threat of a dangerous inflation. He admitted that it is really the tight money policy which is in many ways restricting the industry and that in some measure he is attempting to solve the problem through these national housing amendments. I think that is a wrong philosophy, but I know that the minister who has presented this resolution is not personally responsible for this policy. Certainly it is governmental policy that is seriously affecting the present and future economy of the country.

Having said that, let me also state that I think the alternatives proposed by the minister are sound as far as they go. Certainly it is excellent to provide for the purchasing and rebuilding of older homes. This is one way to help the wage earner in the low income bracket. It will also solve a very real problem which I am told by men in the contracting industry now exists in that it is impossible to move into old sections of our cities and build new homes. Whenever that is done the value

of the new home is automatically lowered without increasing the value of those homes which are already there. A program that will provide national housing funds for the purchase and repair of older homes I think is a program devised on a sound basis. As I said earlier, I am sure this will result in greater benefits than did the winter incentive program.

I noted with interest the minister's remarks regarding university housing and the projects that are under way this year which will accommodate some 6,000 students. This is a satisfactory program but it ought to be extended on a broader scale. How can we expect to house the students at our universities unless this program is extended? I was surprised by what the minister said in regard to smaller, private institutions of learning not being eligible for this type of loan. Surely if we are going to avoid discrimination and be fair to one and all it is hardly right that just the larger universities should be included in this program, with the smaller universities and private colleges being ineligible. I hope that will not be the case when the actual bill is placed before us.

There is another area of real need in the housing industry which falls legitimately within the responsibility and scope of reference of our national housing authority. Perhaps this is a municipal problem but it is one involved in providing the necessary expansion in home units across the country. I refer to the cost of land and services essential to any new home. Ten years ago the cost of land in relation to the value of a new house was about 10 per cent. Now that the cost of land and essential services in new areas has increased the relationship has gone up to between 25 per cent and 30 per cent. Surely that is completely out of balance and represents a further need for assistance to municipal authorities for the provision of new land and services in urban areas or satellite towns.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I remind the minister that there has been a great deal of talk about inflation, but I believe that instead of preventing inflation by reason of the policies of this government, all that is being done is building up inflationary pressures which are working to the detriment of not only the economy but the people themselves. We await with interest the introduction of the legislation.

C A N D I D C O M M E N T S

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader,
Social Credit Party.

December 8, 1966.

CHARTER FOR HUMANITY.

December 10 was Universal Human Rights Day, set aside by the United Nations and agreed to by all United Nations member countries as a day of dedication to the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. December 10, 1966 was the 18th anniversary of the original proclamation by the General Assembly of the U.N. of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In 1948 the horrors and sufferings of World War II were yet fresh in the minds of people the world over. Agreement came readily to the 30 articles of the declaration which were preceded by a preamble which defined the basics of human rights and dignity. These are: (1) The foundation of freedom, justice and peace is the recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family. (2) The highest aspiration of people can only be attained in a world in which human beings enjoy freedom of speech and belief, and freedom from fear and want. (3) Human rights must be protected by the rule of law. (4) Promotion of the development of friendly relations between nations. The peoples of the United Nations in the Charter have reaffirmed and pledged their faith in fundamental human rights and freedoms, and in the dignity and worth of the human person, as well as in the equal rights of men and women, determined to promote social progress and better understanding. To this end is Universal Human Rights Day set aside as a special day of the year to promote respect for these rights and freedoms.

On August 10, 1960 the Parliament of Canada, acknowledging the supremacy of God and the dignity and worth of the human person; and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions;

that freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law; passed the Canadian Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights in clause 1 recognizes and declares that in Canada, without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the fundamental human rights and freedoms entitle each Canadian to the right to life, liberty, security of person and property ownership; the right of the individual to equality and protection before the law; the freedom of religion, speech, assembly and association, and the freedom of the press.

The Bill of Rights forms a vital part of the Canadian way of life. It is well, however, that we remind ourselves not only of this way of life but of our responsibility in it. Too often do Canadians smugly think that all is well, that there is no transgression of this heritage we have pledged ourselves to as a member of the union and in our Bill of Rights. If we would examine ourselves more closely, perhaps Canadians would not be so smug.

Recently the Japanese Canadian Citizens Association protested the use of the word "Jap." This protest stated that "Jap" is a convenient term. It fits into headlines. It's easy to say. But it is offensive to many Canadians. It is derogatory in the same sense that "kike," "wop," "chink," and "nigger," are derogatory. Right-thinking, fair-minded Canadians do not use such expressions. They are a shameful remnant from an earlier era when our country was made up of many unassimilated immigrant groups. But that era is gone, and we are all Canadians proud of our backgrounds and entitled to dignity. So please, don't say "Jap." With this I agree. The Nisei, meaning 'second generation,' are good Canadians.

In the controversy between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians I often hear stinging criticism from both sides. It hurts me

hear Canadians call each other names such as "frogs" or wasps."

An Indian girl of Fort Frances, Ontario spoke of cruelty and prejudice still existing. She expressed hurt and embarrassment at being called "a squaw." She said that she did not mind being taunted and teased but she had a friend who yielded under the pressure and decided to deny her race. I was most impressed by her statement: "I am not a saint - far from it. But I do believe that God made all people the same inside. Maybe the covering is coloured a little differently, but is this a reason to hate? Do beautiful people hate the less pretty? I cannot say that I am better than another, but I cannot say that I am less. I have a pretty fair code to live by. This is it: Indians and Negroes are brought into the world by the same process as are all human beings and are made in the same image of their Divine Creator."

As we stand on the threshold of Centennial, let us pledge ourselves anew to the Charter for Humanity, expressed so well in our Bill of Rights, standing together on the principles we know are right, and forgetting those which divide. Only in this way can Canada be the nation which we believe she is and hope she will be.

C A N D I D C O M M E N T S

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party.

December 21, 1966.

CANADA AT 100:

We stand on the threshold of a new year - 1967 - Canada's Centennial. another year has drawn to a close. I'm sure all of us sometime wish we could stop the hands of time to allow us to catch up on the tasks that are required of us in the span of a year.

Like a news broadcaster, we are constantly faced with deadlines. Once the microphone goes on there is little we can do to change the stories of the day. The broadcast is now over for 1966 and the year has been recorded in the files of history.

I'm sure 1966 presented many challenges to each one of us. Through honest effort much was achieved. We are confident that the accomplishments in the past year will make us stronger to face 1967 - it is for each of us to put his shoulder to the wheel and move forward. At the stroke of the new year, at a moment past midnight, on December 31st, the Prime Minister will light the eternal flame in front of Parliament. It is a commemorative flame for the Centennial Year and the multitude of activities taking place across the nation in every community. May the flame of love of country, of respect for our neighbours, and peace between nations grow stronger this year.

A few days ago I had the opportunity to preview the Centennial Train. My first impression was to realize again that Canada has become truly a nation. A recent editorial in the 4-H Club News of Alberta sums this up most effectively.

"'Never in the history of the world have so few people done so much, and thought so little of it.' This statement contributed to an Alberta historical writer will set the pattern for this editorial. Canada is

one of the largest nations of the world and also among the least populated. Our population stretches in a narrow band about one hundred miles in width above the forty-ninth parallel. The proud Canadian may look at the North American Continent and think of this as the icing on a cake. And icing it must be when we realize the accomplishments Canada has made in a country slightly larger than the United States and only one tenth the population.

The misconception that we are a puppet to England or the United States is sometimes mentioned by our Canadian people. In reality, however, we are a distinct people with a major roll to play in world affairs. Our northern climate and the colossal problem of communications has held our nation from creating a dynamic unified image in our early history. For us new seed had to be developed rather than simply imported from Europe. Communications east and west were a problem of paramount importance and it has only been a few months ago that the Trans-Canada highway brought Canada into easy access of the Canadian people.

Unlike the United States, Canada had a gradual decrease in authority from Britain and a gradual increase in self-government. This process involved many compromises on the parts of both Britain and Canada. A nation that has learned to compromise is one that has learned to respect the wishes of others and will often work for the general good rather than a selfish interest.

Today Canada sits among the highly respected nations at the International Conference tables. Her ability to understand the point of view expressed by others is one of the factors contributing to this respect.

Since Canada is just emerging in to adulthood after conquering many of the physical and legal barriers of unification, we are in a better position to understand the struggle of the new nations of the world. Old nations with rigid customs and traditions often expect a great deal of

conformity from the new emerging nations. Canada as a young mature nation, just a graduate from adolescence, is in an excellent position to help bridge the understanding of the young and old. And because of this, we are in a position to play a major roll in directing the destiny of the world.

We can be proud of Canada and her position - the opportunity, the responsibility and the challenge is ours. The time is now and the place is here. We simply need people who can realize their need and their power and then with positive action we can seed the influence of the maple leaf on all of the soils of the earth. May we pray our actions be just as we prepare to take our place in shaping the world. We have one hundred years of experience and an eternity of potential."

In searching the records of the early parliaments of both Upper and Lower Canada and of the Maritime provinces as well, one will find that three points stand out as being distinctly significant. As men then in public life set aside their political differences, they united on these fundamental principles: (1) That there should be a nation - Canada - independent and separate from all other countries. (2) That in a system of Parliamentary majority rule, the rights of minorities would always be protected and preserved. (3) It is interesting that in the minds of the Confederation Fathers, Canada should be a nation under God and agreed that Canada's motto should be "He shall have dominion from sea to sea." The last part of this quotation from the Psalms appears on the Canadian coat of arms.

Centennial year 1967, although a year with an historical difference will present many of the same challenges as faced in years past. It is my hope and prayer that all Canadians will go forward together during 1967 determined to hold fast in what they believe rightly to be their heritage. May 1967 present to you the opportunity to fulfil many of your goals in life, and at the same time strengthen our sense of national purpose and destiny.

C A N D I D C O M M E N T S

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,
National Leader, Social Credit Party.

December 28, 1966

CONSUMER PRICES

Never in recent times has there been such a tide of concern over the cost of living, especially as it relates to food prices, as there is now. Women from coast to coast have organized boycotts of supermarkets, politicians have joined the cry for action, and the federal government responded by setting up a joint parliamentary committee to investigate the whole aspect of consumer prices and the cost of living.

First of all, it is my opinion that the women of this country deserve commendation. Whether or not they achieved their purpose I will discuss shortly. Certainly they deserve recognition for refusing to accept the fallacy that nothing could be done to lower the prices of essential goods. Too often in our society we are inclined to take a complacent attitude toward injustices slowly being imposed on us, and we fluff them off with catch-all phrases like "That's life" or "There is nothing we can do."

Were the supermarket boycotts successful? I believe they were in that, whether they succeeded in lowering prices or not, they did focus nationwide attention on a vital problem. A certain section of our society refused to accept what appeared to many to be the inevitable.

However, having tossed out well-earned bouquets to the women, I have reason to believe that my earlier prediction - that the actual villain forcing the cost of living to the breaking point will go free - will come true. I had hopes that I would be wrong but, having inspected the Interim Report of the parliamentary committee investigating this matter, all signs point to the fact that the real villain, which I will mention later, will escape the committee's attention.

So far the committee's recommendations are sound. There would be very few, if any, who would disagree with the recommendations to crack down on unscrupulous advertising techniques, gimmick packaging, unwarranted price increases, and a call for public disclosure of the operations of private companies. Are not these recommendations which should have been acted on long ago? The committee has come up with few surprises other than the startling disclosure of the Weston empire.