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

January 5, 1967.

#### "GOOD EVENING COMRADES"

Startling and maybe unbelievable as it may first seem, thousands of Canadian homes have recently been invaded by undesirable visitors from outer space. The invaders have apparently mastered the art of using what might be compared to a Buck Rogers' time machine principle whereby these intruders can project their images just about anywhere in Canada and by this same device travel from home to home with the speed of light. There are scattered reports that these invaders also are endeavouring to master a technique of thought control. Fantastic as this story may appear, it is true.

By a method of divide and conquer, our unwelcome visitors are obviously intent upon taking over the minds of Canadians. Disguising themselves as reporters and commentators, the invaders' most noticeable conquest to date has been the takeover of certain CBC television programmes. "This Hour Has Seven Days" would be a prime example and now we have "Sunday". Subtly and sometimes not so subtly, they have attempted to degrade the law enforcement agencies of our country, attack our nation's political leaders, give separatism a respectable name, revive Nazism, demoralize Canada's youth and build an 'anti' feeling towards our neighbours to the south.

In a courageous and sobering speech to the Canadian Club in Winnipeg, December 8th, John Matheson, the Liberal member for Leeds,
brought to light several startling facts on the CBC programme "This Hour
Has Seven Days". Mr. Matheson points out that of the 499 items carried
in 50 programmes, there was a discernible trend of distortion and censorship by exclusion. By every means possible, several programmes endeavoured to further generate friction between English and French Canadians.

On 28 occasions, the programme dealt with religious subjects. 22 of these were sarcastic or antagonistic in presenting some bizarre and unrepresentative aspect of religion. Of 46 items on business, 38 ridiculed, condemned or stressed wrongs and errors of companies and business leaders. All 29 items on problems of race played up bitterness, injustices or extremism. Two major programmes stressed the delights of drug taking, glue sniffing and L.S.D., without adequately portraying the serious dangers. There were some 80 items touching on American subjects with 62 openly anti-American or playing on U.S. problems and ills. 16 items dealt with the Viet Nam war. As Mr. Matheson put it "15 of these created impressions opposed to the U.S. role in Viet Nam and could have brought nothing but comfort and encouragement to Hanoi." On 14 programmes communism was given sympathetic treatment. Not once in two years was there any substantial criticism of a communist country or the communist philosophy. 15 of 16 items on police and justice left our law enforcement officers in a bad light with no mention or credit for work well done. Only 10 of 69 items treated government institutions, parties or personalities from a favourable viewpoint. The "Seven Days" programme is just one of many that are now loaded with distorted truths of what is actually the case in Canada and the rest of the world today.

What has happened to some of the ringleaders of the invasion?

Well, Patrick Watson is still around and has put himself on public record as maintaining that the CBC's roll should be, and we quote, "To destroy or confuse, or upset public opinion." Why, just the other night Mr. Watson hosted a programme on the Russian Revolution, a programme which witnessed the resurrection of the father of socialism,

Carl Marx, who through an actor, came back from the dead once again to preach his socialistic ideals which history has now proven to be false.

Mr. Watson's partner in leading the invasion, Laurier Lapierre, is now top organizer in Quebec for Canada's party of the left, the NDP. What about producer, Douglas Leiterman? He has left the country.

It may be difficult to give an exact definition to what truth is, but certainly there is no question about the fact that truth is not distortion, but rather is a state of being complete, whole or unbroken. It is fortunate that Canada has men of the calibre of John Matheson who will stand up for what they believe in and demand from such powerful media as the CBC, the right to receive a balance in public programming and an accurate reflection of the truth.

It is up to you and me as Canadian citizens to earnestly seek a way to make our public broadcasting system more truly the servant of the Canadian people rather than the master. Unless we do preserve the integral parts of democracy, the form of government that has given each of us so much to be proud of, then this country will be ripe for take-over by our invading visitors from space.

I am sure many of you have looked at a picture and at first glance something may have escaped your view, but upon taking a second look, a rather important detail may come to light. If you haven't already spotted our invaders, I hope that many will take a second look. It is now being rumored that if our unwelcome visitors continue to escape nationwide attention, they will eventually adopt a password phrase for positive identification. It may go something like this - "Good evening comrades".

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

January 12, 1967.

# "ON THE STATE OF THE NATION"

Whether we like to admit it or not, the economy of this nation is in trouble - trouble that very easily could tip us into a financial crisis of major proportions.

The cost of living rose 4% during 1966 and is forecast to go still higher in 1967. Home constructions lag 22% behind demand. Strikes in essential areas of public service threaten to upset the balance of the economy. Tight money is throttling industrial and commercial growth. Taxes are escalating as government expenditures have increased by 20% in one year. Interest rates and debts are at an all time high and apparently will go still higher. Government debt at all levels is spiralling upward. In fact, the total debt in Canada - private and government - is dangerously close to the total assets of the nation. In other words, by sound business practices after 20 years of unprecedented productivity, the country verges on bankruptcy.

You say it is impossible. Well, I am far from being an alarmist; that is until I read the facts. I am even more concerned about the amount of the earnings of Canadians taken back by the government. In 1965 the earnings of Canadians - the national income - was just under 39 billion dollars. Total government expenditures stood at 19 billion dollars - just under 50% of all we earned. In 1966 the national income was about 42 billion dollars and government expenditures increased twice as rapidly and hit a figure in the order of more than 22 billion dollars - in excess of 50% of our national income. What does this mean? It means just this, that out of the total earnings of Canadians, governments at the three levels - municipal, provincial and federal - by various means, collected more than half of it.

Let us remind ourselves of the fact that governments have no

secret source of revenue. The only source of government income is the taxpayer's pocket - the taxpayer who is also the consumer.

It is said there is inflation in Canada. There is no inflation of money. We are short of money. There is, however, inflation of prices - the cost of living - through high usury, high taxes and big and bigger government.

What is the answer? First, there must be a halt in the increase of government expenditures and a corresponding halt to tax increases. Secondly, areas of priorities in welfare, education costs and capital development must be established. Thirdly, restrictive and unequitable taxes and laws regarding business and resources development must be eliminated with greater allowance for initiative, thrift and enterprise. Likewise, monopolistic cartels and unfair trade practices must be strictly controlled. Fourthly, national income must be equalized with the market value of the total national production of consumer goods and services. The debt building policies of governments and commerce are not only wrong, they are and will continue to the point of national and personal bankruptcy. It was already evident that this would happen in 1966. Tight money and higher taxes are not the answer. There must be a financial and monetary policy which will keep an adequate supply of money and credit in the economy to purchase what the economy does produce. Debt cannot and never will be the basis of true prosperity and maximum productivity. Fifthly, the reforms to the Bank Act must not permit an increase in interest rates. On the other hand, the Bank of Canada can be effectively used to supply an adequate amount of money and credit sufficient to balance with the value of production plus provisions for public capital development at minimal cost.

It is neither just nor right that a one million dollar school or hospital should eventually cost the Canadian taxpayer two million

dollars. Canada, in this technical age, needs a "Consumer Economy".

The Bank of Canada is responsible to the Minister of Finance for monetary policy. I suggest to him that our debt system can be abolished if our credit - Canada's credit - which is the nation's monetary supply, is issued as a clear asset to the state so that money will be spent into existence, not lent into existence. I say it can and must be done simply because we can't continue as we are now.

In 1935 Prime Minister MacKenzie King said: "Once a nation (meaning the government) parts with the control of its currency and credit, it matters not who makes the nation's laws. Usury, once in control, will wreck the nation. Until the control of currency and credit is restored to government and recognized as its most conspicuous and sacred responsibility, all talk of the sovereignty of parliament and democracy is idle and futile." The former prime minister's statement was true in 1935 and it is just as true in 1967.

There is very little argument about the fact that this nation's economy is in trouble. We must be bold and face the fact that a financial system that seemed to adequately fill the needs of Canadians years ago is now woefully lacking. Just as many farmers years ago were reluctant to part with their horses as the means of plowing their fields, Canadians may be reluctant to put archaic financial policies out to pasture. I should hate to think that Canadians, who have rushed to keep abreast of the latest technological developments in science and industry, would fail to pursue sound economic policies which are in step with the times.



# HOUSE OF COMMONS CANADA

#### Dear Constituent :

This letter comes to you as a summary annual report from your Member of Parliament. Usually Parliament completes the annual session just before Christmas and the new year's session begins in January. Tradition was broken this year as the old session has carried over into 1967. It is expected that the Centennial session will commence shortly after Easter and, in its first half, will be concerned with the Speech From the Throne, the Budget and the estimates for the year's expenditures. Most Members of Parliament, particularly Party Leaders and members of the Cabinet, will be extremely busy through the summer months with Centennial activities. The latter half of this year's session will start in the fall and will deal with more specific legislation.

The 1966 session made much progress although at times it seemed lost in frustrations and turbulence. I say "progress" because, if passing legislation is progress, the 1966 record is impressive. More items of public business were dealt with than in any session in recent history—almost 120 pieces of government legislation, as well as 45 private members' Bills. The Bills I sponsored have not been discussed this session. These concern the appointment of an Ombudsman, revisions to the Expropriation Act, and the setting up of a Yukon-Alaska Highway Authority. The most important legislation passed by Parliament this session is the guaranteed income for senior citizens. This issue was turned into a political football, which could have been avoided if the government had acted at the beginning of last year, as promised.

The various committees have been extremely busy. I am a permanent member of the External Affairs Committee and have also served on the Committee on Finance, Trade, and Economic Affairs, as the different Bank Bills have been considered. One of the important special committees is the one investigating the increase in the cost of living. Perhaps the most frustrating aspect of Parliament is that in spite of all of the debate on such matters there is little action taken to remedy the real cause.

Cause of the turbulence in Parliament is twofold. The first concerns the constant partisan feuding and the second involves strikes and the threat of strikes. A number of major strikes loom on the 1967 horizon and it becomes more and more apparent that those vital areas of labour which concern the public interest are going to somehow be removed from the realm of strikes. The Minister of Finance has called for a slowdown in spending and yet, paradoxically, the increase in the federal budget has been more than 20%.

The new federal constituency boundaries have been declared by law. Red Deer Constituency lost Didsbury and a row of townships on the south, but has gained Lacombe and two rows of townships on the north as well as the eastern towns and surrounding communities of Delburne, Lousana, Elnora, Huxley and Trochu. Technically speaking these new areas will not become part of Red Deer until the next election is called, although most M.P.'s are assuming the responsibility of their new areas now.

The pressure of duties in Parliament and public speaking engagements have prevented me from spending as much time in the constituency as I would like. However, I have been in every area through the year and shall continue to keep in direct contact with every community. I wish to remind and invite you to write to me respecting any matter concerning the federal government. It is not only my duty to attend to your problems but I sincerely appreciate receiving your opinions on any topic relating to the federal scene.

May I take this opportunity of extending to each of you my very best wishes for a happy and prosperous Centennial Year.

Sincerely yours,

R. N. Thompson, M.P.

# Bob Thompson Hits Civil Service Tactics KITCHENER - WATERLED KECORD - 10 5 nu 17By RICHARD JACKSON, The Record's Ottawa Correspondent

OTTAWA — With the Liberal government preparing later this year to give its nearly 200,000 employes the right to strike . . .

With the Conservative Opposition each time pleading the case for striking federal employees when, illegally, they have walked off the job, paralysing essential public services . . .

With the New Democrats trying to rationalize the illegality of these strikes of government workers by calling them inoffensively the "withholding of services" . . .

services"...

Finally, with Parliament playing along in these charades by legitimizing, or at least condoning these clearly illegal strikes.

WHO, THEN, if anybody, speaks for the taxpayers, the public at large?

Oddly, perhaps, the public defender is turning out to be Social Credit leader Robert Thompson.

He alone in all the House of Commons has been speaking up. And in tough, blunt tones with hard, sharp words, branding some of these strikes within the federal government as, frankly, "blackmail."

The "impossible"—an illegal strike by federal employees—happened for the first time some 18 months ago when postal workers, in defiance of the government and the law—walked out.

UNDER the Civil Service Act and the terms of their employment, federal governmen't workers have not the right to strike.

And in the special sphere of essential public services—transport and communications—it has been taken for granted by all concerned except, as it turned out, the postmen, that they were, in fact, enjoined from strike action.

Under the act, the government possessed a weapon of its own: the power to discharge and impose pension penalties on strikers. Or, less radically, to threaten.

But instead, in the case of the postal workers, it negotiated. Again this year it negotiated. And now says, in the face a third strike threat in the post office, it will negotiate again.

THAT FIRST post office shut down did the initial damage in showing that sup-

Later Contract

posedly "impossible" strikes were not only possible, but as things since have turned out, probable.

Each time since that there has been a strike, or a strike threat — the seaway workers, Air Canada's office staffs, its mechanics, its control tower men, the postal workers again, and the rest—the Conservatives have allied themselves with the New Democrats with demands that the government give in and buy off the strikes by the simple process, as John Diefenbaker puts it, of "going into the public treasury."

And in each settlement, of course, it has been the public treasury—you—that, has paid. And this in the pattern for the last 18 months.

THEN UP spoke Robert Thompson—and while, unless the completely unexpected happens, nothing will come of it—he did sound a refreshingly new and different note.

He spoke for the taxpaying public, in these words during negotiations and the settlement-that - wasn't - really - after-all - a - settlement of the threat-ened postal strike:

"I should like to say," he told the House, "that strikes in the past were accepted as a part of the legitimate process of labor-management relations."

And while this still held true today, another factor demanded urgent consideration. It was this:

"Strikes," he said, "can also be used as a pretty formidable club.

"IN FACT, when they involve a national transportation service, their threat can amount to public blackmail.

"It is my opinion that the time has passed when the government should have taken the initiative to provide legislation to cover certain essential services in this country because the national economy can't function satisfactorily if it is to by continually disrupted by strikes."

If Robert Thompson were to turn his constructive attention to such urgent domestic problems and forget his futile fascination with foreign relations, perhaps Social Credit, speaking for the right—the political point of view further right than John Diefenbaker's radical Conservatives — might break out of its provincial strongholds in the West and get somewhere nationally.

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

January 25, 1967.

# PLANNING + ACTION = PROGRESS

Parliament in recent years has lost much of its image and public respect. Parliament - the very heartbeat of the democratic process - has deteriorated to a point where public opinion is at its lowest ebb. Conscientious MP's on all sides of the House are discouraged and fed up with the apparent inability to make progress. One cannot help but think it is well that we in 1967 do not have the responsibilities the Fathers of Confederation had 100 years ago because it is certain Canada would never have happened and we wouldn't have a Centennial.

Many of parliament's ills today are the result of inadequate and out-dated rules and procedures coupled with 11th hour decisions on parliament's programme of recommended legislation. As an example, Prime Minister Pearson astounded the House on January 25th by announcing that the government planned to complete some 20 major pieces of legislation prior to the end of this session. He suggested that the present session would prorogue on March 10th, leaving 33 more sitting days to deal with the outlined legislation. On this basis the new session would begin on Monday, March 13th with a weeklong Easter adjournment and a Centennial session to begin about mid-May.

In addition to a budget debate, the Prime Minister's enunciated legislative measures include the defence bill, the setting up of a special committee on rules and procedures, the public service bills, Bank Act amendments, broadcasting legislation, a bill to amend the Canada Corporations Act and the Citizenship Act; all pieces of legislation which will require considerable time. It is ridiculous to expect these to be completed in 33 days.

It should also be pointed out that the government's attempt to

hold a club over the heads of opposition members by stating that a summer recess depends on the progress made in dealing with the proposed legislation will not be tolerated. To threaten members with the possibility of being denied sufficient time to meet their commitments can only be construed as parliamentary blackmail for the purposes of legislative expediency.

I am in agreement with the Prime Minister that a recess of Parliament is essential during the summer months. In this connection, members of parliament have a definite responsibility to the people of Canada to share with them the celebration of our Centennial. It is the responsibility of members of this House to assist in a very specific way in making our Centennial celebrations what they should and must be if our Centennial is to have its desired impact. Personally my Centennial commitments are many and continue through the summer. The Prime Minister termed his statement in the House "a programme of Parliamentary action." Let me say to the Prime Minister and to all members of the House that, before parliament witnesses any real "action", there must be changes. I would suggest the following:

- (1) Rules and procedures of the House should be streamlined to meet the needs of the day.
- (2) The government should carefully plan in advance the programme of legislation to be introduced. It is not good enough to leave the establishment of a special committee for rules and procedures a mere six weeks prior to the expiration of the old rules; just as it was not good enough and entirely unnecessary to extend the Bank Act three times because new legislation was not prepared.
- (3) The opposition, while its duty is to oppose legislation with which it disagrees and to amend legislation when possible and when required, must also carry its responsibilities for positive progress. It is not good enough to merely oppose for the sake of

- opposing or to attempt to defeat or to embarrass the government for political advantage.
- (4) New ways must be found to keep the back benchers active and constantly at work. Caucus discipline must not be allowed to discourage and render useless vast numbers of excellent men who occupy the back benches.
- (5) Finally, a minority government in a House of minorities could function effectively with the removal of the constant threat of defeat. It is my contention that a government, majority or otherwise, should stand open to defeat only on money bill votes or on direct votes of non-confidence. In other types of legislation the majority would make the decision.

Should these suggestions be taken to heart, as they are meant to be, I'm sure the image of parliament would quickly improve and the Canadian public would look to Ottawa with confidence in this our Centennial year and in many years to come.

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

February 8, 1967.

# CANADIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS OVERSEAS

Foreign aid has become a term which most Canadians associate with assistance to the developing nations through the External Aid office of the Department of External Affairs. The majority of Canadians regard it as a fair responsibility which Canada, in a quiet but determined way, has established, with an excellent record. This is particularly true through the Colombo Plan and its extension to other Commonwealth countries. However, there is an aid programme in Canada, initiated, inspired and carried on by young people, which few older Canadians know very much about, although a special section for those in later years has just been added.

This programme, carried out by university students, is Canadian University Students Overseas, known as CUSO. During the last few years CUSO has operated as a private organization doing a tremendous service to most of the developing countries. Through CUSO, volunteers from our universities, without fanfare and until a few years ago entirely at their own expense, move into a bootstrap operation dedicated to help people to help themselves. So important has this service become that, although it continues to be a private organization, the government now assists through transportation and administrative grants. The young people who formulate CUSO's policies and direct its activities, and likewise the senior advisory council, are determined to maintain it as a private organization, flexible and responsible to needs and situations as they arise. I hope it does continue on this basis because herein is the strength and the success of its mission.

It has been my privilege to observe CUSO volunteers at work in several countries, standing in a magnificent way as they join hands

with young people of the countries in which they work. The unique and accepted ministry of these students, I believe, is basically because the CUSO volunteer does not represent a government. Rather he is a Canadian dedicated to helping others in the fields of practical daily living, standing on his own strength and worth as a true neighbour and friend, because it is his desire to do so.

ments of government in the countries in which they work so that their basis of living and activity is on a direct par with the nationals whom they serve. This very fact has made CUSO most acceptable to foreign governments which recognize the spirit of friendship and goodwill of these young Canadians, working shoulder to shoulder in the job these governments find difficult or are unable to do themselves.

One of the great resources of Canada is the reserve of goodwill which has been built through the years by individual Canadians who, working in practically every country on their own initiative and very often under pioneer conditions, help others. Canadian University Students Overseas is a legitimate and modern addition which every Canadian should be proud of and certainly is a service which all Canadians should know more about. Personally I regard it as one of the most positive and re-assuring developments in the post-World War II period.

As the number of volunteers grows, the problems of expenses and support increase. It is my hope that Canadians, individually and collectively, will back the vision and dedication of these young people so ably demonstrated in CUSO. What better gift for our Centennial and what better Centennial project could there be for this country? In what more effective way can we help our neighbours in other lands who are not so blessed as we! What greater formula for peace!

Cuso is the only national, non-denominational organization in Canada which undertakes to provide opportunities for all qualified Canadians (and not just university-trained personnel) to spend two years "serving and learning" as a volunteer in a developing country. Cuso officially launched its programme in 1961 with a mere 17 young Canadians heading out for foreign fields until today, in 1967, there are 549 Canadians abroad working under Cuso.

In this our Centennial year, let us remember we stand among the very top countries of the world in our standard of living, and let us each take pride in the fact that our country is making this splendid effort to help those not so fortunate as we are. Truly CUSO is one of the projects which makes us proud to be Canadian citizens.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,

National Leader, Social Credit Party.

February 15, 1967.

# CANADA - AT 100

SOME OBSERVATIONS ALONG THE WAY AS OUR NATION REACHES HER 100TH BIRTHDAY.

In the year 2200 B.C. the Hia dynasty was founded in China, and no prudent historian would give any precise dates as to how long China had been a nation before that time. This gives them at least a 4000 year start on us as a nation. Until very recently, and indeed even now in many parts of China, life goes on much the same as during the Hia dynasty - the steps forward - if forward at all - in many instances - have been slow - very slow.

How about Canada's steps forward - a country in her earliest infancy when compared to China's long history. What is the progress picture of her first hundred years?

Since the first of 1967 on every hand - through TV, radio and the press, the magnificence, the vastness and the potential of Canada are unfolding before our eyes - as the momentum increases for our Centennial celebrations.

At EXPO, through cities, towns, hamlets and rural areas the tempo is rising. Canadians on every hand seem to be coming truly alive, quickening to the truths of our heritage. Perhaps for the first time some of us are experiencing a surge of pride as we recognize our part in all of this - we are CITIZENS OF CANADA! It is being pressed clearly on our thinking that this means we are citizens of a land rich in those things which make for national greatness. Canada stands today on the threshold of unprecedented development - ours is a new land - a good land.

Back in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries when the Cabots, Cartier and Champlain landed on the shores of the new world, they must have stood

awe and wonder as they endeavoured to assess the worth of this newly-discovered part of the world. Some of them may have gone back to their homeland feeling they had seen all, or at least most of Canada, and may have felt they had a thorough grasp of all this land had to offer - how little they really had learned!

Today many Canadians have a similar restricted view as did these early explorers, recognizing, in a broader sense 'tis true, the vast untapped resources of Canada. There are some of these who say Canada has reached her peak - that she has been discovered. These are impatient with the slowness of our growth and progress and are asking, "What is wrong - we are not moving forward - we are standing still, marking time?"

For the encouragement of those who are wondering if as a nation we have progressed as we should, or at all - let us take a hasty look back - even to 1497 when the Cabots planted the first British flag on Canadian soil -- to 1534 when Jacques Cartier sailed up the majestic St. Lawrence to Hochelaga (now Montreal, and this year the home of the greatest exhibition in the world's history) to the 1600s when Canada's shipyards ranked fourth in the world - the Welland Canal - first Canadian railroad line - the Atlantic cable --- and then on July 1, 1867 when Canada became a nation. China at that time was carrying on much as she had during the Hia dynasty.

Since that memorable day in 1867 Canada has moved steadily forward from a land of virgin forests, untilled fields, untapped natural resources, and sparsely settled areas to a nation of teeming cities, humming industry, excellent transportation, modern conveniences and a voice in the affairs of the world.

What are our hopes and ambitions this year as we stand on the threshold of our second century? Where are we going? The nation will

~ . . .

go where we as individuals go - for we are the nation. The future of Canada rests in our hands - in the hands of the young people of our schools and universities, the leaders of government, the church, industry -- and most important of all, the homes. Canada will be molded by all of us - each will do a part - for good or for ill.

It is now two years since Canada adopted her own flag. During the "flag" debate in the House of Commons I stated, "It is well that we should remind ourselves that no emblem, no flag, whatever it may be, will in itself establish the meaning and loyalties which a flag should carry to a nation and its people. It is only as those things which people themselves represent, and stand for, are known and respected, not only to their friends, but to themselves, that the emblem and flag of a nation can be held in the regard and esteem they should be. In other words it is not a flag that makes a nation: it is a nation that makes a flag...."

Among my observations I find one of the happiest Centennial features to be the interest and response on the part of the young people in our schools. Their many excellent projects can have no other effect than to stimulate pride in the hearts of those taking part. A few weeks ago, after the Centennial flame, which will burn for the year 1967, had been lit on the grounds immediately before the Parliament Buildings, one of my staff observed a teacher and her class of little pupils encircling the flame singing "Happy Birthday Canada." This may seem a small matter to some engaged in large Centennial projects, but in my book this has the seeds of greatness for our nation, the making of strong citizens. Yes - China had a start of over 4000 years on us - but by comparison the achievements of Canada in her first 100 years are almost unbelievable -- No - we are not dragging our feet - history disproves this and the days ahead - who can say? Canada has an enviable reputation among the nations of the world - untapped natural wealth which baffles the imagination, a proud citizenry composed of people of many nations, who can challenge the world in practically any field of endeavour. Let

us stand erect - we are citizens of a country which could well lead the

world in the days ahead!

#### CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,

National Leader, Social Credit Party.

February 22, 1967.

# MANAGEMENT AND CANADA'S FUTURE

The survival of the individual competitive way of life is vital to Canada's future. Free enterprise which has produced so much for so many, must not be discarded, either by intent or carelessness.

The Economic Council maintains that Canadians have never had it so good. In spite of an occasional ripple, signs on the surface point to a continuing affluent situation; however, the business barometers and long-range forecasts indicate there are storm centres ahead. The wise business man could well be making a special effort to look behind an imposing and pleasing front at the reality which it so often conceals.

Present trends indicate that debt at all levels - government and private - will continue to rocket. It is inevitable that taxes will go higher as we struggle to pay for new proposed programs of greater government spending, pension plans and medicare. Prices too will go higher as costs, including taxes, are reflected in prices. If this trend is allowed to continue, in another ten years private enterprise will not even be able to protest because it will not be strong enough to make its voice heard.

It is imperative that, if the individual enterprise way of life is to survive, we find ways to expand freedom, not to contract it. This is the great challenge which confronts us in this second half of the twentieth century. This is the real challenge of business management. Government management appears intent on heading in the other direction. If it is allowed to continue, we shall find ourselves at the storm centre more quickly than we realize.

I am convinced it is today's businessmen who can save the situation. Businessmen are in the best position of any group in Canada to take the responsibility for the country's future. They do not depend on votes. They have freedom of action. What is needed is a far-seeing vision because "Where there is no vision the people perish." If we are convinced that the free enterprise system is good we must be prepared to explain why.

We have reached the point in our economic and social development when management must make a united and concerted effort to enlighten the public regarding the essential importance and value of the private enterprise system. The proponents of the private enterprise way of life have failed in their responsibility to keep the people informed so that the advantages of the freedom we now enjoy are understood. We have failed to expose the disadvantages of falling completely into a welfare state, or, beyond that, gross socialism.

As an example of this socialistically inclined era, an implied stigma is attached to the word "profit." The fact is, that in spite of abuses, profit is the factor which has enabled the economy of this continent to produce a standard of living unequalled anywhere in the world. Even Russia admits this as she presently integrates the profit system into the Communist state centralized system.

It is a fallacy to assume that, because prices are high, profits are accordingly high. The truth is that high prices do not necessarily result in high profits. Profit is that sum of money the business man or farmer has left after he has paid all the cost of obtaining, producing and selling his product and has paid the taxes levied on his enterprise.

One of the biggest deterrents to the private enterprise way of life is our antiquated, unfair taxation system - long overdue for realignment and re-adjustment. The present tax situation has developed because of politicians outbidding each other to obtain the power given to them by a public which is constantly being educated to believe they

can get something for nothing.

It is up to businessmen to impress upon the government the importance of getting together on vital areas of taxation. It is an intolerable situation when the management of our country goes to bed one night to awake the next morning and find, as a result of new government policies, that entire new terms of reference have suddenly been changed which will affect its operation from top to bottom.

It is imperative that management carry a greater degree of responsibility toward the public and the government. It is likewise essential that government consult with management, with labour and groups in the social structure. It is only in this way that Canada and Canadians can look to the future with any degree of hope and confidence. By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P., National Leader, Social Credit Party.

March 1, 1967.

# CANADA - THE CROWN

One of the great advantages of the British parliamentary system is the separation of the head of state from the wrangling and discord of partisan politics. The Crown, immune as it is from the factional disputes that characterize political activity at every other level, symbolizes in a most personal way the continuity and the stability of the nation. The Crown, then, is more than any political issue, no matter how violently that issue may move Canadians at one time or another, for it serves as a permanent link between all generations of Canadians, binding the new-born to those who moulded confederation one hundred years ago.

The continued integrity of national identity is safeguarded in the Parliamentary tradition with the Queen in Parliament. argue that our system would remain intact with a President rather than a Monarch seem oblivious to the dangers of politicizing the head of That office should symbolize all of the people, and not just those whose Party was fortunate enough to win a majority in the last The head of state represents all members of the nation regardless of racial descent, religion or political party. The Monarch not only is representative in the above sense, but also in its very hereditary nature allows the institution to symbolize all generations - those who have toiled to build Canada and are now gone, and those who are still growing and learning. The warm familial bond of the Crown links them together as an elected and temporary President The Crown is a living embodiment of a country's past, could never do. present and future. The American President has never filled this role for he is the successful product of a political Party for a particular period in history. Our American cousins rely instead on their flag and their eagle, symbols of great worth to be sure, but hardly comparable to the living and personal institution of the Crown.

At a time when the very young seem indifferent to the standards of their elders, and when the old, in turn, are often intolerant of the new ways being forged by their offspring, there needs to be a reminder that the important bonds which link them together in this Canada transcend the debate of the moment.

Canada's Queen cannot be here in residence and so we are fortunate indeed to have as her servant such an honourable and distinguished gentleman as Governor-General Vanier. With Madame Vanier at his side, resplendent in her dignity and unexcelled in her dedication, the office of Governor-General is a fine example of the nobility to which this nation should aspire in this centennial year.

When we become discouraged at the state of our Parliament, or dismayed at the divisiveness that seems to burden us at all levels, the Governor-General and Madame Vanier constantly reappear on the scene to remind us that not all is ill in the state of Canada.

Canada is a nation weaving a tradition, subjecting a vast and untamed land to man's will. This task lies beyond the vista of one generation. It is a task which requires stability and order, steadfastness and nobility of purpose. While these qualities may seem to often elude us in the every-day activities of our political process, they are firm and secure in the institution which the Queen's representatives so ably represent. In this sense it is unfortunate that a leading newspaper columnist should imply, not so long ago, that the Governor-General is not a dedicated supporter of the Royal institution which serves us so well, and that its disappearance would not seriously affect the integrity of the nation. I can well understand Governor-General Vanier's

disappointment and concern at such an implication. No two people, in their position, have been more loyal to their Queen and more devoted to the Canadian people than the present gracious incumbents at Rideau Hall. I can think of no ground for questioning their dedication.

# CANDID COMMENTS

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

March 8, 1967.

# THE BILL OF RIGHTS

With the death of Canada's Governor-General, we are reminded of the principles and ideals for which he stood, and which were exemplified in his daily life. The rights of the individual and the freedoms we cherish were of vital concern to him.

I believe it is fitting this week, as we honour the memory of one who served so well, that Canada's "Bill of Rights" be read by all of us.

- "1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely,
  - a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;
  - b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law;
  - c) freedom of religion;
  - d) freedom of speech;
  - e) freedom of assembly and association; and
  - f) freedom of the press.
  - 2. Every law of Canada shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of Parliament of Canada that it shall operate notwithstanding the Canadian Bill of Rights, be so construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe or to authorize the abrogation, abridgment or infringement of any of the rights or freedoms herein recognized and declared, in particular, no law of Canada shall be construed or applied so as to
    - a) authorize or effect the arbitrary detention, imprisonment or exile of any person;
    - b) impose or authorize the imposition of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment;
    - c) deprive a person who has been arrested or detained
       (i) of the right to be informed promptly of the reason for his arrest or detention,
      - (ii) of the right to retain and instruct counsel without delay, or (iii) of the remedy by way of habeas corpus for the determination of the validity of his detention and for his release if the detention is not lawful;

- d) authorize a court, tribunal, commission, board or other authority to compel a person to give evidence if he is denied counsel, protection against selfcrimination or other constitutional safeguards;
- e) deprive a person of the right to a fair hearing in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice for the determination of his rights and obligations;
- f) deprive a person charged with a criminal offence of the rights to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the law in a fair public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, or of the right to reasonable bail without just cause; or
- g) deprive a person of the right to the assistance of an interpreter in any proceedings in which he is involved or in which he is a party or witness, before a court, commission, board or other tribunal, if he does not understand or speak the language in which such proceedings are conducted.
- 3. The Minister of Justice shall, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council, examine every proposed regulation submitted in draft form to the Clerk of the Privy Council pursuant to the Regulations Act and every Bill introduced in or presented to the House of Commons, in order to ascertain whether any of the provisions thereof are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this Part and he shall report any such inconsistency to the House of Commons at the first convenient opportunity.
- 4. The provisions of this Part shall be known as the CANADIAN BILL OF RIGHTS."
  - " I am a Canadian, a free Canadian, free to speak without fear, free to worship God in my own way, free to stand for what I think right, free to oppose what I believe wrong, free to choose those who shall govern my country. This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold for myself and all mankind."

These rights and privileges which were personified in the life of our late Governor-General must be much more than a "piece of paper," they must be woven into our way of life. Only in this way are the rights of every Canadian citizen guaranteed.

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

March 15, 1967.

# EASTER - A CERTAINTY

16 3 M

This week I prefer not to dwell on those matters, some of which vitally concern us as a nation, such as consumer goods, divorce, drug costs, trade, industry, defence and all the rest. I am sure there is something of infinitely greater importance which should have its rightful place in our thinking as individuals, and as a nation, at this time - the unchanging truth of the Message of Easter - the indisputable fact of the Resurrection.

Statistics advise that at the present time half the population of Canada is under twenty-five years of age. Apart from exposure to the saturation of the minds of Canada's young people by an avalanche of paper-backs and magazines of questionable rating, there seems to be an ever-increasing number of people who are shouting their loudest that "God is dead", with a sprinkling of so-called preachers who dare to tell us a Church can be run without belief in God. One such who is, I am glad to say, forbidden to preach longer in one of Canada's oldest and most honoured churches, has written the much-talked-of book "A Church without God" and among his statements is "the doctrine of the after life has no meaning."

This could be a cause of grave anxiety to us were it not that history records many such books having been written - read - and forgotten, while the truth of the Easter Message has stood, and will stand as an unshakable fact, a joyous certainty for all, throughout the ages.

I do not mean we should ignore the effect which exposure to this type of writing and thinking may have on the young people - and even on some of the older people of Canada. It is not for us to become despondent, however, or to deplore the fact that more and more statements

ひ - と 布

of disbelief in the Christian faith are crowding our book stalls, and even emanating from some of our country's pulpits. It is becoming increasingly clear that those of us who look forward to the approaching Easter Season, with all it means, must realize the truth of what was said in part by our late Governor-General as he gave his final public talk to the students of the University of Montreal - "This is a time of struggle between good and evil when each of us must do his share - where there is no place for the cowardly or the weak."

At this Centennial Easter Season I feel it is not only my duty as a public citizen, but my privilege as a Christian, to state again my belief in the truth, "Him (Christ) God raised up the third day ...... through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." I add also the other well-known words of Scripture, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain."

The fact of the Resurrection has been a stumbling-block throughout the years to a world determined not to acknowledge Christ, or to give Him His rightful place; but as someone has said, "to try to retain Christianity without the Resurrection, is like trying to retain a definition with nothing to define."

I do not intend to spend time proving the truth of Easter, which is the heart and core of our faith. I do not believe this great fact needs to be either defended or explained. It stands.

THE STONE WAS ROLLED AWAY by an Almighty, Invisible Hand, and there was a Resurrection Morning!

May I wish for all of you a Joyous Easter Season.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

# CANADA IN THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

March 22, 1967.

On my recent trip to the Far East I visited six countries, in addition to Hong Kong, from Japan to Singapore. I conferred with prime ministers, presidents, generals and government officials, businessmen and students, farmers and fishermen. It was an in-depth experience of great value. Without exception, all were generally friendly toward Canadians and Canada. I spoke to officials from as many more neighbouring countries in the area also.

Whether we deserve this goodwill or not is questionable - the opportunity for world service and influence which is there is certain.

The tragedy of it all is that Canadians for the most part seem to be neither interested nor concerned about obligation or opportunity. Other nations no larger than Canada and not as affluent are doing much more than we are. Outstanding in a long list of such nations are Australia, West Germany and Holland. Red China has a population of more than 700 million. However, deep in a struggle for power between factions of the communist party, and now in confusion and turmoil following the great cultural revolution and the Red Guards, the focus of attention is turned more and more to those smaller countries which border the Pacific rim and which have a combined population of nearly 300 million. Practically all of these countries have settled into some reasonable form of political stability and in recent years have blossomed into economic prosperity and influence.

The first of these at the northern anchor point is Japan with a standard of living unprecedented in Asia. With great industrial strength, Japan dominates trade and economic development. At the southern end of the line is Australia. With only one-seventh of Japan's population, but with confident and aggressive affluence, Australia has almost overnight become a nation with which to be reckoned. Having a

trade pattern which exceeds that of Canada with Japan, Australia is moving into a position of political and economic leadership. The recent elections rocketed Prime Minister Holt into a position of responsibility and importance.

In between are the vast population groups of India, the Philippines, Burma, Malaysia, Thailand, the three Indo China countries of Laos, Cambodia and Viet Nam, Free China on Taiwan, Korea, and the free port states of Singapore and Hong Kong. Far in the lead of these three nations are Korea, Taiwan and Thailand. Each of these has for the past three years had an annual economic growth of more than 7%, and the same rate of growth projects into the future. All are food sufficient and even food-exporting. Thailand will export more than one million tons of rice this year. Taiwan is becoming an industrial nation, with the greatest population concentration of any country. Her land reform programme has become a model for the emerging world and, as a result, free China has aid projects of some magnitude in many Asian and African countries. Korea has become most attractive for foreign investment and development. More than one thousand Koreans each month are applying as immigrants to Canada. Three-quarters of those applying are qualified in skills and education. The scars of the war have all but disappeared. Paradoxically Canada has no direct diplomatic or trade representation in any of these countries.

The six of us on this trip were given an extremely warm welcome. It seems almost strange to me that, without exception, these countries are hungry for a closer relationship with Canada. They welcome and encourage Canadian trade and investment. In each country we heard talk of a Pacific community of free nations co-operating for mutual advantage and strength.

Canada is a nation from sea to sea. She has carried her responsibilities well on the Atlantic side, as ties reach back to the European countries. However, Canada is also a Pacific power and she must now turn to the east as well. It is not enough to vacate her rightful Pacific chair as she has done in the American hemisphere. This is Canada's challenge and opportunity. In a world of nations moving ever closer together, Canada must take her place with Japan and Australia and every free nation in between. When she does that there will no longer be a communist China - rather the Chinese people will have realized that their only hope is with freedom and democracy and will have turned in that direction. This is the might of peaceful development and free people. This is the only force which will rid Asia of tyranny and war. Canada is part of the Pacific community.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

March 29, 1967.

# VIET NAM, MARCH, 1967

The Viet Nam war has been described as the most confused war in history in spite of the fact that it is being fought in the full glare of 'fish bowl' publicity where the details of the day's battles are carried on the news wires of the world even before the military communiques are drafted. It is described as the most difficult war of modern history where ill-equipped guerrilla forces with "invisible leadership" hold at bay nearly three-quarters of a million of the best equipped and trained military forces the world has ever seen. This war is called the cruelest ever fought, as civilian casualties far outnumber the military and as supporting public opinion falters far behind the spirit of the fighting men.

Since our return from Viet Nam and the neighbouring nations of the Pacific rim, many have questioned me about whether or not there is any just reason for the war to continue. How long will it continue? there any hope for a settlement? Should Canada give more support or should Canada outrightly condemn the American stand? Obviously in five days in Viet Nam I cannot pose to know all the answers. The newspapers are full of the opinions of pseudo experts who, out of superficial observations or preconceived prejudices, comment with apparent authority on a subject that goes much deeper than a casual impression. I dare not add to this confusion. However, I can pass on the answers to these questions which in turn we asked those who are responsible for the decisions in the war and who have continued experience and participation in the events which we read and hear of through the communication media. Amongst those whom we met and questioned are Prime Minister Ky, Foreign Minister Do, Ambassador Lodge, Ambassador Porter, General Westmoreland, the R.O.K. Commanding General of Korea, officers of Australian brigade,

officials of the International Control Commission, as well as the foreign ministers and prime ministers of Korea, Free China and Thailand. In addition we spoke to a number of other senior government officials in each of the countries we visited, including Japan, as well as to civilian correspondents and observers including many Canadians, as civilians on the spot.

1. IS THERE ANY JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CONTINUATION OF THE WAR?

To withdraw from the Viet Nam war now would mean to turn over South Viet Nam to the communists and strengthen the communist support of the so-called "revolutionary wars of liberation" in Laos, Cambodia and Thailand for inevitable communistic takeover. It would destroy the image and position of the American influence. It would be an irresponsible abdication in favour of communist domination in the Pacific.

2. IS IT REALLY A WAR OF AGGRESSION BY THE UNITED STATES?

How can it be a war of aggression when it is being fought on South Vietnamese soil against forces which are in a large measure from the outside, equipped almost entirely with foreign supplies and weapons. The number of South Viet Nam revolutionaries within the so-called "national liberation front" are small indeed. They control their areas and people through murder and terror with North Vietnamese communist direction and support.

3. WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED IF THE UNITED STATES HAD NOT STOOD FIRM IN 1965?

If the United States had not taken this action, showing to the world that communism could go so far but no farther, the 1966 communist coupe in Indonesia would have succeeded and Indonesia would now have become a full connumist nation. Indonesia's confrontation with Malaysia would have become a fullscale war. Thailand could never have held its present position and would now have been engaged in a Viet Nam type of

war in its northern areas. Burma would not have changed its political direction towards the west as it has. The recent Japan election would not have turned against the socialists and communists. Communism would have been on its way for a complete Asian takeover.

- 4. IS ANY PROGRESS BEING MADE IN THE WAR OR DOES IT GO ON ENDLESSLY?

  Much more of South Viet Nam is now safe for pacification and peaceful development. The morale of the Viet Cong has gone down. Defection
  of the Viet Cong to the Vietnamese government has shown a marked increase. Viet Cong military strategy is reverting to guerrilla type
  action. A pacification programme is beginning to become most effective
  in establishing rural government and control. By the end of the year
  the military phase of the war will be even more improved. Guerrilla
  warfare will continue until pacification is complete and political stability is established. This phase of the Viet Nam struggle will take a
  long time.
- 5. WILL THE BOMBING OF NORTH VIET NAM ESCALATE THE CONFLICT TO WORLD WAR III?
- No. The bombing is directed at military and industrial targets concerned with the war in Viet Nam. The military effort of North Viet Nam cannot continue on its present scale. China is more and more involved with its local power struggle and domestic problems. Russia becomes increasingly embarrassed by the deterioration of its relationship with China and its difficult position in supporting North Viet Nam. Bombing will cease immediately North Viet Nam indicates its willingness to meet at the conference table.
- 6. IS THERE ANY POLITICAL STABILITY IN THE SOUTH VIET NAM GOVERNMENT?

  The situation is improving. The newly elected constituency assembly has completed the new constitution. There will be a presidential and constituent election before the end of this year. Premier Ky told

us that he has pledged himself to open and free elections similar to those held last year when more than 80% of the total population participated. Observers are convinced that Ky and his government are maturing and that their administrative effectiveness is improving. There is a long way to go but the trend is upward.

- 7. SHOULD CANADA OPT OUT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION AND PARTICIPATE DIRECTLY IN MILITARY OPERATIONS?
- No. Canada's role will be essential when the conference table is reached. The United States, the Vietnamese, the Australians, the governments of the neighbouring countries all want Canada to maintain its position with the International Control Commission which presently seems futile but which in the future can prove vital.

Generally speaking, these are the answers we received to our questions.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

April 5, 1967.

# TIME FOR TAKEOVER

The passing of the late Governor-General Georges P. Vanier marked the end of an era. Before many months have gone by, Prime Minister Pearson and Opposition Leader Deifenbaker will have bowed from the scene. The next election, whenever it comes, will see the passing of many oldsters, some through the pressures of years, others by the will of the electors. The day of the takeover generation has arrived. This is the age group of men and women born during the depression years of the late twenties and the thirties. Those depression years are a part of their experience only as they remember their parents having talked about them. Many of them will recall the years of the Second World War as young people in school. They are the post-war generation of leaders waiting eagerly in the wings for the turn of events which inevitably and soon will give them their chance. That chance came to Jean Chretian this week. At 33 he became the youngest member of the Federal Cabinet. came also to John Turner, who at 38, was given the senior cabinet portfolio of Registrar General. The chance came a few months ago to Robert Clark who, at 29, became Alberta's first Minister of Youth.

Age is unevenly balanced in Parliament. The average age of the Senate, in spite of a few recent appointments, approaches the minimum requirements for old age pension. In the House of Commons the majority of members are in their late fifties and sixties — only 38 are under forty. Strangely, the middle generation of leadership is weak — due largely to the fact that more than 100 thousand of this age group gave their lives in World War II.

There are more than 10 million Canadians under the age of 25. They demand action and imaginative initiative. Only a very few are extremists or of the beatnik variety. The vast majority are sensible people

from stable homes and communities, who resent the bombastic approach of old-time politicians, as they do the domineering "look down your nose" attitude of the old type business boss. Rather they want leaders who are in tune with their own temperament and attitudes. They want government initiative on the major problems of water and air pollution, low-cost housing, consumer cost protection, automation, labour management relations - not just vote-catching themes of more welfare and election promises. They want their parliamentarians to streamline procedures and rules to remove the present roadblocks of a Parliament which has already lost much of its vitality and public respect. They want action and new techniques to deal with escalating problems of urbanization. In short, they expect and will soon demand legislation dealing effectively with those problems which touch the everyday lives of Canadians.

In this situation age is not the only qualification of the takeover generation. The youngsters will need the support and the steady hand of those who are older. Most important is the degree of concern and the awareness of the changing scene on the part of all who are able to appreciate the recent words of John Turner, "The Canadian people will no longer permit government to shelve good ideas and have them gather dust or leave them as unexecuted blueprints for the future." Richard Needham of Toronto's "Globe & Mail" put it more bluntly when he said, "It's a young country we have, with mostly young people; but old men run it in an old way, with an old man's fumbling and fears; and that is the Canadian comedy or tragedy, according to how you look at it."

The late Governor-General Vanier, who last July 1st, although an old man, was moved by a young spirit and outlook, said, "The anniversary of the Canadian Confederation is ... an appropriate moment to examine our national conscience and say whether or not in 1967 we will as a nation be able to stand up under the world's scrutiny...

"The time has come for us to demonstrate our gratitude for the incalculable blessings which Providence has bestowed upon us. No person can rise to the real stature of spiritual manhood if he has not discovered that the finest dedication he can make of his life is that of service to his fellowman. There may be some who will say that such dedication is all very well for our young people. Would any of us really dare to say that it is only the young who have the duty to serve? Each of us can and must remain young ourselves in heart and spirit."

Hats off to the past, coats off to the future, could well be the motto of old and young as we approach our nations second century. This is the challenge of the new era which faces Canada, her 20 million people, and yes, her new Governor-General, Roland Michener as he takes up the reins of office. "The King is dead - God save the King."

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

April 12, 1967.

### BILL C-170 - CLOSED SHOP FOR CIVIL SERVANTS

On February 17 during the debate on Bill C-170 (The Public Service Staff Relations Act granting civil servants the right to organize - a right I fully endorse - which allows the government, as employer, and the unions to conclude agreements containing provisions demanding that civil servants, once they are union members, must maintain their membership as a condition of continued employment and that other civil servants must pay union dues in order to hold or obtain employment) I asked the President of the Treasury Board, Revenue Minister E. J. Benson, to refer the Bill to the Minister of Justice in order to obtain a statement of opinion as to whether or not the Bill violated Section 3 of the Bill of Rights. That ruling having been make necessitates my further comment.

I totally disagree with former Justice Minister Cardin's unfounded contention that Bill C-170 in no way "abrogates, abridges or infringes any of the rights and freedoms recognized and declared in the (Canadian) Bill of Rights."

As I pointed out in the House of Commons, and in particular to Mr. Benson, "I believe that, if we are to preserve the loyalty and perpetuate the dedication that we have in our public service at the present time, we must be very careful to enshrine in the legislation that we pass in this House basic freedoms which, in my opinion, would include the right of freedom to associate as well as freedom to dissociate."

Any form of compulsory unionism, including the maintenance of union membership and the compulsory dues check-off provisions permitted by Bill C-170, violates the letter and spirit of the Canadian Bill of Rights, which unequivocally states: "It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without

discrimination .... the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely, (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, .... (c) freedom of religion; (e) freedom of assembly and association; ...."

Compulsory unionism is an ugly form of discrimination.

When a civil servant is <u>compelled</u> to support a union espousing principles and practices which are contrary to his basic beliefs and convictions, he is in effect coerced into embracing a view of life and labour, <u>not his own</u>. If the freedoms of association and religion mean anything at all in our land, they should at least include the freedom to support the organization of one's free choice.

Why should a civil servant be compelled to pay dues to the Public Service Alliance of Canada, which is affiliated with and is an integral part of the socialist, NDP-supporting Canadian Labour Congress?

Why should any Canadian, committed to a different political philosophy, be forced to pay tribute to and help finance movements which he cannot in good conscience endorse?

The right to work is a God-given right. No government, no union, and no company may abrogate it. The United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which Canada subscribes, has, in Articles 20 and 23, also recognized man's right to work and freedom of association - "No one may be compelled to belong to an association." And "Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment."

Canadians everywhere must protest the government's flagrant violation of the Canadian Bill of Rights and of the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Canadian Government should be consistent and not simultaneously talk out of both sides of its mouth. It should, once and for all, abolish compulsory unionism, which is nothing more than a modern form of slavery and unworthy of a nation whose sons have valiantly sacrificed their very lives for the cause of liberty.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

April 19, 1967.

# THE HOUSE OF PATRONAGE

Prime Minister Pearson came to power in April, 1963. During the intervening four years Mr. Pearson has made 31 appointments to the Senate.

Five of these appointments were awarded for long service in the House of Commons as Liberal Party members.

Five appointments came for devotion to duty in the backrooms of the Liberal Party.

Five appointments were made in recognition of miscellaneous and sundry services in behalf of the Liberal Party in various provinces. The most prominent of these is the recent appointment of the former Ontario Liberal Leader for Ontario, Andrew Thompson, who "retired" just two days before his elevation to the Upper House.

Five Cabinet Ministers were "elevated" to the Senate, seemingly to give honour to distinguished members of the Privy Council, but more likely to relieve the Prime Minister of the difficult position of not knowing what to do with them. The Senate provides a safe pasture for worn out disposable Cabinet members.

Five appointments were made for no other obvious reason than the ability to collect campaign funds for the Party treasury.

Three more were recognized for their valour, as Liberal candidates, in facing great odds that prevented them from getting elected to the House of Commons, after repeated attempts.

Two appointments were made for reasons which are difficult to determine because of their personal obscurity prior to becoming Senators.

One appointment was made for obvious merit to a distinguished educator, a university president, a man whose service and stature are accepted from the Maritimes to B.C.

highways, airlines and waterways - and linked by radio, television and telephone networks. We are bound together too by the knowledge, gained from men and women of many races, that harmony need not mean assimilation. Today we are twenty million Canadians, half of us less than 25 years of age. Our roots run back to overseas motherlands, but our loyalties are inseparably linked with Canada. We are grateful to the past, invigorated by our current progress, and inspired by the challenge of the years which lie ahead.

As I have read the record of the early pre-Confederation provincial parliaments and conferences, I realized that Canada became a nation because the Confederating Fathers were willing to set aside those things which divided them, in favour of standing together on the three basic areas in which they did find agreement. They agreed first that there should be a nation called Canada, independent and distinct from all other nations. Second, in this new nation which was to be democratically governed, the system of majority parliamentary rule could only remain strong if the rights and freedoms of the minorities were protected and guaranteed. The Confederating Fathers agreed that the most important minority of all was the individual who, as a human being created in the image of God, must have those freedoms which in the past 100 years have been the basis of the Canadian way of life. Third, the Confederating Fathers knew that, if their vision for the founding nation was to be perpetuated, Canada in her destiny must be a nation under God. Psalm 72:8 became the basis of the motto of the new nation. In abbreviated form it is inscribed across the face of the Canadian Coat-of-Arms. May it always be true of Canada that "He shall have dominion from sea to sea."

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

April 19, 1967.

## THE HOUSE OF PATRONAGE

Prime Minister Pearson came to power in April, 1963. During the intervening four years Mr. Pearson has made 31 appointments to the Senate.

Five of these appointments were awarded for long service in the House of Commons as Liberal Party members.

Five appointments came for devotion to duty in the backrooms of the Liberal Party.

Five appointments were made in recognition of miscellaneous and sundry services in behalf of the Liberal Party in various provinces. The most prominent of these is the recent appointment of the former Ontario Liberal Leader for Ontario, Andrew Thompson, who "retired" just two days before his elevation to the Upper House.

Five Cabinet Ministers were "elevated" to the Senate, seemingly to give honour to distinguished members of the Privy Council, but more likely to relieve the Prime Minister of the difficult position of not knowing what to do with them. The Senate provides a safe pasture for worn out disposable Cabinet members.

Five appointments were made for no other obvious reason than the ability to collect campaign funds for the Party treasury.

Three more were recognized for their valour, as Liberal candidates, in facing great odds that prevented them from getting elected to the House of Commons, after repeated attempts.

Two appointments were made for reasons which are difficult to determine because of their personal obscurity prior to becoming Senators.

One appointment was made for obvious merit to a distinguished educator, a university president, a man whose service and stature are accepted from the Maritimes to B.C.

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 cooperative 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.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

May 3, 1967.

# DOPE, DIVORCE, ABORTION AND GOD:

Dope and LSD, divorce and illegitimacy, abortion and venereal disease epidemics daily occupy headline space in the news stories of the land. A feature article in a recent paper states that within the next century governments will decide the size of a family, that a licence will be required to have a child, and that tax penalties will be imposed on those who do not obey. It is little wonder that many religionists claim that God is dead. If one were to heed the constant harassment of that which is becoming accepted as norm of human behaviour, the developing degradation in the customs and morals of general living would not only be obvious but inevitable.

Is the cry for dope, legal abortion, and freer divorce laws real, or does it represent only an outer fringe of irresponsible immaturity? Surely it is not evidence that the country has "gone to pot." Perhaps a major factor is that Canadians seem more and more willing to trust their moral codes and ethics to the criterion of general public practice. This lowest common denominator of human behaviour results in a faceless society which deadens the very conscience of the individual.

A personal friend, Dr. Paul Campbell, put the situation and its answer very clearly in an article of the same name as this "Candid Comments". He said: "Men's minds and hearts are today tugged at by a confusing mixture of forces. There is science promising longer and fuller life for millions with one hand and instant death for millions with the other. We talk of colonising the planets while millions still live in the slums on the earth.

"We see all religious doctrines and moral imperatives challenged and dismissed; God dethroned by cynics, debunked and destroyed by churchmen; permissiveness promoted, when at the same time the nation spends millions a year caring for unwanted children.

"There are pills for fertility and anti-fertility acclaimed with equal publicity, and we face a growing epidemic of drug-taking proving once again that a purposeless existence is too painful to bear.

"Thousands of people overeat and cut short their lives by choking their arteries with fat. Millions on the other hand have to live on their own tissues because they have not enough food to fill their stomachs, till there is no fuel left to keep the fires of life burning. We see some seeking to escape from death by having themselves quick-frozen like dinosaurs caught in an iceberg, in the hope that they will be unthawed when the cure for their ailment has been discovered. Is it possible for us to strengthen our minds, hearts and backs sufficiently to face the real world frontally without fear, and to live in such a way as to advance the cause of man on earth?

"My father emigrated to Western Canada before World War I. He was a man of faith. He lived what he talked about. My mother believed with fullest confidence in the inspiration of the Old and New Testament — and in caring for her neighbours. There was a wholesome harmony to our family life — a spirit of selflessness, neighbourliness, service, a joy in living and a fearlessness about dying far removed from and far more attractive than the ambitious rivalries, the heartlessness, the fears, the dirt and the drink which marked the society in which I lived as a doctor. My parents' convictions and commitment were considered out—dated, yet they cared for the people across the street and across the world. My colleagues and I were so modern we held few convictions and avoided all commitment, but we cared only for ourselves. The contrast kept niggling at my mind.

"The sanity of my family's way of life was more and more substantiated as I gained more and more clinical experience of medicine. There

is nothing like a fact to explode a theory. I wish those who advocate abortion as a trouble-saver, who push the contraceptive pills and permissiveness, would get off cloud nine into the wards of a hospital and face reality.

"While serving as a hospital intern I was one day hurriedly called to see a girl who had just been brought in. She was about seventeen years of age. She was alone. Her face was bluish-grey. She whimpered between feeble gasps for breath. With the last beat of her heart she gave birth to a dead infant. Her abortion attempt had resulted in a blood infection which killed her.

"The new moralists may be able to argue away a sense of sin but not a case of syphilis. Venereal disease is on the increase and in some cities is reaching epidemic proportions. The use of contraceptives is bound to increase the spread of disease. The pill offers no protection against the gonorrhecoccus or the spirochete. Protection against conception is not protection against infection.

"In the out-patient clinics we treated the girls from the brothels, invariably infected with usually gonorrhoea and syphilis. But it was not just the prostitutes who needed care. While on the staff of a large US hospital I remember a most attractive couple. I visited them in their beautiful home. He was a business executive. She was ill. She had a severe infection of gonorrhoea. I will never forget the pain, misery, expense and frustrated hopes which that woman endured. 'Forsaking all others...till death do us part' may be an old-fashioned concept of marriage but it is sound scientific practice.

"Today abortion is seriously put forward as the answer to self-indulgence, pills are made a substitute for purity, and permissiveness is portrayed as the portal to the promised land. I need say nothing about the rightness or wrongness of these attitudes, the silliness of them speaks so loudly.

"The brain, which many in our day have come to worship, is a false and fickle god. Science when substituted for faith ceases to be science Science is simply a facing of all the facts, an uncovering and relating of more and more truth. Because science leads to truth it can only substantiate and never destroy faith that is real in experience. Some use their brains and their science to undercut faith. But they have to prostitute both to do it. Science by nature can only be an illuminator never a liquidator of what is true, both in the universe around us and in the universe inside us."

There cannot be an answer to these age-old problems of man and his civilization apart from God and the moral laws He has so firmly established. The answer to the revolutions of the material world, to the upheavals in customs and morals can only be found through the revolution of human nature, available through a personal experience and faith in God. There is no other way.

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

May 10, 1967.

### CRISIS AND COLLAPSE IN THE CBC:

I have spoken critically of the CBC on many occasions. My criticisms have been constructive, aimed at pointing through the weak spots to more sound and effective policies. I believe, whatever its faults, that the CBC does represent a basic ideal in the fabric of Canadian life. It is difficult to imagine Canada with the entire load of broadcasting and television left entirely in the hands of commercial interests. Even the US is presently moving away from this position. With educational TV just around the corner, the role of the public sector becomes even more vital. However, having said this I hasten to emphatically add that the present situation in the CBC, both in regard to policy and leadership, is inadequate and intolerable.

Recent leadership in the CBC has been weak and faltering. Presently CBC has no leadership at all - it has collapsed. The president has resigned. Everyone knows Alphonse Ouimet is leaving. His departure and the appointment of a successor awaits government action. The senior vice-president has also resigned. Another vice-president has been assigned to the Caribbean. Caretakers have taken over the chairs of leadership. Caretakers are not what the CBC needs.

The programming for 1967-68 is now taking shape on the drawing boards. Commitments and contracts are being finalized. If there are faults in CBC programming, and I am convinced that there are, it is now evident that these faults will be projected for at least another year. Any who hope for a change - those who urge a new vitality in the CBC must remain silent. An editorial writer of one of our major newspapers stated it well when he wrote: "Even the rumours have been dying down. Time was when it was whispered that the secretary of state, Miss LaMarsh had matters in hand. The whispers vanished into limbo. Then

it was both heard and whispered that the prime minister was making the matter one of urgent concern. The urgency, one assumes, vanished. The vast ship maintains some kind of way, but there is nobody to steer.

"To add to the difficulties, even at the risk of maintaining our nautical metaphor, the charts are becoming out of date. The country is changing, therefore, the audience is changing. We stand on the threshold of vast changes. Yet here we all are, using the charts of yesteryear, which, we fear, will lead us to some distant shore where no harbour exists."

Television is a force which few of us fully know or understand. Used properly, it can mould and improve our nation and its character. Used in the wrong way, it can destroy the moral fibre of our people - and our nation.

It has been reported that a number of leading news personnel are resigning. The dispute centres around the question of the authority to editorialize by the CBC's hired hands. How long must we wait before the CBC once again restores its broadcasts to reporting, leaving the comment to those it invites to express an opinion. The CBC was once a reliable and unbiased reporter. That can no longer be said of it. To do this it may mean that Stanley Burke must be given the authority to collect and organize the news as well as to read it. Whatever the answer, the CBC desperately needs leadership. Indecision is not the answer. It's time to end CBC's agony. It is the responsibility of the federal government to solve the problems causing unrest within the corporation. For the sake of an important and expensive public corporation, its staff, and the Canadian people who look to the CBC for programming in line with its cost, this indecision should be brought to an end.

By: R.N. Thompson, M.P.

June 21, 1967.

#### ISRAELI - ARAB - U.N. CRISIS

The fighting war has stopped - the talking war continues. The Sinai and the Negeb are quiet - the halls of the UN echo with the tirades of the propaganda blasts. In three days the Israelites demolished the Arab forces and their Russian tools of war. It will take weeks and months for the Arabs to cover their defeat and loss of face in the courts of world opinion under the direction and initiative of a red faced Russian political offensive.

The UN talks and manoeuvres with its own usefulness and prestige at the lowest ebb since its birth - and well should its worth and function be in question. The UN had done little recently to inspire confidence. The only effective action it has achieved, in fact, in the last few years has been the speedy withdrawal of the Emergency Force from the Middle East a few days before the outbreak of hostilities. Nasser screamed; U Thant jumped: peace keeping collapsed; Arab taunts threatened Israeli annihilation and open warfare followed. Russia bulldozes its face-saving attack to condemn Israel an aggressor, yet it was the same Russia that put billions of dollars of military hardware in the hands of the Arabs, trained them how to use it and finally egged them on to do so. Russian leaders, if only they would try a little, could join the US to assure stability in this dangerous part of the world. However, stability and peace are the last things the Russians want. The idea of stability and quiet runs counter to communist policy. They believe they will reach their goal of world domination through the spread of dissension, mistrust and local wars. A smarting, embarrassed Arab world will likely turn to rockets in its hatred and quest for revenge.

Let's go back a little lest we too should be fooled by the propaganda barrage. It is only a few weeks ago since Syria's hotheads were

calling Nasser a coward. Jordan's King Hussein was at open odds with Syria and Nasser. Saudi Arabia's King Faisal was fighting an undeclared war with Nasser in the Yemen. Arabian nationalists killed each other in the Aden area. Nasser screamed for the assassination of King Hussein. Lebanon's traders tried to keep out of it all, doing business as usual. Israel peacefully struggled to make a garden homeland out of stubborn desert, all the while keeping a weather eye on the persisting storm clouds on her border horizons.

Then suddenly Nasser ordered the UN peace-keeping troops out of his way so his troops could attack Israel, and sent his navy to the Gulf of Aqaba to blockade Israel shipping. His press and radio cried for war. Egypt mobilized. Jordan rushed to Cairo to sign an Arab solidarity pact. Syria acknowledged Nasser as Commander-in-Chief. Arab refugees were armed to the hilt. Even Lebanon joined with Nasser in the cry for Israel blood. Nasser, the politician, had seemingly won out. He had proved himself clever at pitting the US against Russia, taking everything he could squeeze from both. Russia built his Asswan dam. The US fed his hungry millions and bolstered his faltering economy. In the meantime, he built his military machine. Russia supplied more than two billion's worth of arms, rockets and airplanes. The US gave \$1.1 billions in food and aid. Simultaneously Nasser used the pretense of Israel's menace to hold together his Arab influence and keep alive Arab nationalism. The cries of Jewish hatred and boisterous militarism helped soothe the bitterness of the hungry and unemployed.

In this recent crisis the west was strangely silent. They did agree that it was most unfair of Nasser to close off the Gulf of Aqaba - but nobody dared to do anything about it. U Thant unilaterally ordered the UN forces home. One whiff of Nasser and everyone at the UN picked up and ran. The peace-keeping force evaporated. The UN didn't object -

at least not very loudly - when Nasser announced, "Our aim will be to destroy Israel." It caused little evident response from the UN, Paris, Moscow, Delhi or even Washington for that matter. All of those who now talk and talk at the UN were then seemingly willing that Nasser and the Arabs should "exterminate the Israelis and drive the remnant into the sea."

Early on the morning of July 5 the military situation exploded. Then followed a fantastic week. 2,700,000 Israelis against 100 million Arabs presented a modern David and Goliath. In a few astonishing hours of incredibly accurate and devastating air attacks 400 Arab airplanes were obliterated and the armoured blitz moved quickly south and west across the Sinai. Two days later the Israelis had accomplished complete military mastery over the Arab nations and 80,000 Egyptian troops and \$2 billion of communist war machines and tools littered the desert sands. The week belonged to Israel.

What is the future? The UN has been weakened as it proved itself ineffective and helpless in crisis. It has become a forum for the propaganda war - a tool of the big lie technique where nothing is judged on its own merits of right and wrong. Morality has become relevant to reality only when it is convenient or expedient. Television coverage provides a vast audience for the servants of dictators and the force of might. Those who claim to be the champions of human liberties and the integrity of national rights are strangely quiet or perhaps helpless to speak out. Israel will demand and ultimately must have a greater guarantee of safety for her shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez and for her Jordanian and Syrian borders. The final guarantee of this will come in bilateral agreements with her neighbours beginning with Jordan.

Arab nations will likely nationalize their oil industries and will attempt to find alternative markets, but Russia does not need oil and

the Arab nations cannot live without their oil revenues. Cuts in oil and Suez canal revenue will breed political unrest. Gradually the Arabs must return to the west for trade and aid.

Russia, having lost much prestige, will re-arm Egypt. It is the easiest way to regain status and control in the Middle East. Ferment and intrigue will continue but with less dramatic results.

Egypt's economy will deteriorate rapidly. Even now she is on the verge of going broke. Her trade balances are hopelessly in the red and her credit is nonexistent. Starvation faces millions of people without American food. The defeated and humiliated soldiers, combined with casualty lists, will weaken public confidence in their leaders. Nasser, now riding the crest of a public frenzy, will soon find himself in a most difficult position. The reopening of the Suez is essential, although the removal of scuttled ships will take months. Without Suez, Egypt will be bankrupt. Arab disunity will continue. The fighting in the Yemen between republicans and royalists, between Egypt and Saudi Arabia is far from settled. The factional hostility in and around Aden will continue to fester. Jordan's critical economic problems will force her away from the Syrians and Egyptians. She cannot survive without British and American help. Communism will operate underground to rebuild and hold her domination of the Middle East. In Somalia in northern Ethiopia the build-up for new local wars will continue.

The US and the UK face a difficult, if not impossible, job of rehabilitation in the area. There are difficult days ahead. The world cries for peace - but there is no peace.

Missing Pages.....

#### CANDID COMMENTS

By: Robert N. Thompson, M.P.

June 28, 1967.

# 100 YEARS LATER - JULY 1, 1967

One hundred years ago, on July 1, 1867, the British North America Act became law and the Dominion of Canada became a nation. Today, 100 years later, we celebrate that great day, in the realization that the dream of the Fathers of Confederation is a living reality. Truly, as spoke Georges Cartier, Canada has taken her place amongst the nations. The courage, dedication, vision and work of the Confederating Fathers, as well as of the pioneers who joined hands with them, or who have followed in their wake, is our great heritage. Milton's words appropriately apply to these men who with "Providence being their Guide they builded better than they knew." Let us thank God for His great mercy, and with those attributes of character and conviction rededicate ourselves to the same responsibilities and goals which in turn now rest with each one of us who together make this nation.

Canada has been described by the Centennial Commission as a country on a map, sprawled across the top half of North America - nearly four million square miles - a land singularly blessed by nature. In the beginning our forefathers came to seek wealth and a new way of life. First the French, then the British, separately, began to explore and chart this vast and unknown land. Then, across a conference table, they combined their strength. That was 100 years ago. Now we possess this land in common under the maple leaf, symbol of the great forests we have hewn down together.

An equal welcome is extended to all who come - and millions have, from many parts of the world, of varied racial origins. They have brought hands, brains, skills and ideas. They have helped us spread out over this enormous territory - blessed with most varieties of climate and almost every natural resource - joined now by railways,

missing Payes

By: R.N. Thompson, M.P.

July 5, 1967.

# Elizabeth II - Queen of Canada

This has been a great week for Canada, more important and farther reaching than we yet realize. The visit of Queen Elizabeth has been an unqualified success. The nationhood of Canada has been confirmed.

The wild and spontaneous cheers that came from an overflow crowd as Her Majesty took her impromptu minirail ride through Expo were indicative of the warmth of her welcome by Canadians. It was true also of her welcome as she arrived in her royal blue BOAC jet. It was true of her moving speech to the outdoor assembly of Parliament and later in the afternoon at the July 1st birthday party on Parliament Hill as the happy holiday spirit enveloped the crowd of between 60 and 70 thousand present. It was true at Lansdowne Park on that same afternoon when 17 thousand teenagers gave her a tumultuous welcome. It was true at Beauharnois, Quebec when the town emptied itself almost to a man to bid her welcome and then cheer her on her way in the Royal Yacht. It was also evident, although in a different way, when the several thousands present almost tearfully in moving spirit at eleven Wednesday night bade the Queen farewell as the Pipers played "Will ye no come back again."

It had not started that way, as a small group of headline hunting news people, including the sensation hungry reporters of the London Times, tried to create a climate of fear and suspicion as they boldly announced that this was the last visit of the Queen to Canada. The CBC on the first day of the Royal tour seemed to hopefully add this comment to every newscast and commentary. Some newspapers, such as the Toronto Star, to justify their editorial opposition to the Queen, tried for the first two days to minimize the warmth and depth of the reception given to her. One Star story headlined "The Queen arrived in Ottawa last night to about half the reception Santa Claus normally gets." "The crowds were thin and the cheers weak," said the same story. However, this negative attitude was completely drowned out by the truth the second day.

What happened during this tremendous visit was a forceful answer to those who have contended that the Queen was a divisive force in Canada. The cheers which followed her wherever she appeared were just as loud and emotional in French as they were in English. The CBC changed

its tune, as did the Toronto Star. On July 3 the Star described the visit "as one of the most regal triumphs of any of her Canadian visits." The Canadian people liked their Queen, whether they saw her in person or on television. A French Quebec newspaper said "A Queen in a minirail is not seen every day." No wonder the same paper reported that her welcome was friendly and lighthearted - the very best Quebec tradition. Even Premier and Mrs. Daniel Johnson openly enjoyed their visit with Canada's Queen as they conversed freely in French.

Queen Elizabeth does not divide Canada. Whenever Canadians have the opportunity to hear or see her, she unites us! The Crown as an institution did not falter this week - instead it gained new strength, as the wearer of that Crown reminded us again that Canadians truly are one family. The good wishes of every Canadian went with Queen Elizabeth and there were frequent and open expressions of the hope that she would soon return. It turned out that the most difficult job for the RCMP, who were ever evident in watchful security, was the children having strayed from their parents in the crowds.

The question for Canadians at the present time is simply "Is the new spirit evident in the country during the past few days going to continue?" This Centennial year is a time of great hope for Canada - if we move in on it quickly. Not only does it concern our responsibilities to ourselves and the freedom so vital a part of the Canadian way of life - but also the development of our resources, human and material, by Canadians and for Canadians. We must demonstrate that the Canadian way of life meets the needs of Canadians. As we are able to do this, the world will look to us for inspiration and for guidance. The second century of Canada's history must perpetuate all that is good in Canada and at the same time project itself to those elsewhere who are less fortunate than we. In a world filled with strife and need, this is our opportunity, yes, and our duty.

e <u>E</u>

By: R.N. Thompson, M.P.

Labour Day, 1967.

## "CENTENNIAL LABOUR DAY"

A Gallup Poll recently conducted by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion revealed that "most Canadians feel that our greatest asset is freedom". Gallup Poll interviewers across the country sought to find out what people thought were the best things about living in Canada. According to the release, one word shone forth like a beacon light - "freedom". Nearly half the population (43%) named one freedom or another - personal freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of thought, freedom of expression, political freedom. This fact was supported by a second Gallup Poll a few weeks ago when Canadians were asked if they supported the right to work through "Open Shop". 73% of non union Canadians said "yes" and 67% of union members said "yes" also. In the first poll the second best thing named by 13% of the people was "working and living standards, good wages, greater opportunity and good food". A fifth of the people (20%) could not think of any good thing about living in Canada.

It is heartening that so many Canadians cherish freedom that they consider it "the best thing about living in Canada". Indeed, freedom is precious, provided we understand its origin and meaning. Freedom begins where people recognize that absolute authority belongs to God alone and that He is the author of liberty. Freedom is not a license to do as one pleases but the opportunity to do what is true. Consequently, we are obliged to honour God who is the Truth. The foregoing principles underlie the basic constitutional liberties that find expression in the Canadian Bill of Rights whose preamble reads in part:

"The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions;

"Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;"

Both Federal and Provincial Governments have the God-given task of safeguarding the civil rights and freedoms of the Canadian people so that they may live in accordance with their deepest convictions - Christian, Communist, or otherwise. Those in authority must encourage the free development of our society and prevent the usurpation of authority and the abridgement of freedom. Governments would do well to set an example by recognizing its boundaries of authority and by respecting the freedoms of its citizens and their institutions. There is a disturbing trend in Governmental action, namely, the encroachment on activities which are none of its legitimate concern.

Ottawa, in cooperation with the New Democrats, put their stamp of approval on <a href="Bill C-170">Bill C-170</a> (Public Service Staff Relations Act) which grants government agencies and unions the right to conclude contracts which contain clauses compelling civil servants to pay tribute to a specific union as a condition of employment with the Federal Government. Instead of upholding the civil rights of freedom of association and religion, it infringes on them and paves the way for discrimination and dictatorship. Many a civil servant may soon be compelled to support unions whose sympathies lie with the socialist Canadian Labour Congress and the New Democratic Party, even though 7 out of 10 Canadians say they do not want such compulsory unionism. Such freedom-robbing action could mean the beginning of the end of political freedom in Canada - one of the freedoms named by the people interviewed by Gallup Poll interviewers.

Freedom entails responsibility. If Canada is to survive as a

truly free and independent nation, those who understand freedom should use it responsibly and should insist that the Government preserve it. Furthermore, they should educate the 20% who, according to the Gallup Poll, "couldn't think of any good things about living in Canada". It is our responsibility to see to it that liberty is not turned into license but is exercised in such a way that all men everywhere, especially those of the emerging nations, look to Canada as a shining example of true democracy where the minorities as well as the majority enjoy equality of opportunity and the privilege of having just and non-discriminatory laws upheld by a Government that understands its sacred duty and the limit of its power.

At this centennial Labour Day it would be well for all Canadians, young and old, those who work as employees and those who work for themselves; those who are union members and those who are not; to rededicate themselves to the cause of freedom and justice, and most important of all, commit themselves to the sovereign God, Creator and Provider of us all. Without God, His love and His grace, His laws and moral standards there has never been, and there will not be in the future the freedom that we now enjoy and which is so much the cornerstone of the traditional Canadian way of life.

CBC - Promotion of Degrading Programming

# A Personal Message from Your M.D.

ROBERT N. THOMPSON

COMMONS DEBATES

Member for Red Deer

November 5, 1987

#### BROADCASTING

IMPLEMENTATION OF CANADIAN POLICY

The house resumed, from Monday, November 6, consideration of the motion of Miss LaMarsh for the second reading of Bill No. C-163, to implement a broadcasting policy for Canada, to amend the Radio Act in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential and related provisions.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): It is not my intention to prolong this debate and I respect the words of the hon member who has just resumed his seat. However, I do think that at this stage it is our responsibility to express our thoughts on the basic principles which underlie the legislation. It is therefore my intention to speak briefly from the point of view of a parent about this broadcasting legislation and the responsibility we all carry, and will carry for a number of years.

During the last three or four years I have received an increasing number of protests from parents in Canada on the subject of broadcasting, particularly television. I am convinced that the basic unity of Canadian life and of the Canadian way of living rests with the Canadian home. It is an old adage that Canadian families have the same right to expect wholesome and pure types of program from the public broadcasting corporation as they have to expect pure water from their taps. While this concept may be considered old fashioned, it is a truism that some means must be devised whereby the taxpayer must have some say in how his tax dollar is to be spent, and no taxpayer is more important than those who are heads of Canadian homes.

We have a new broadcasting bill before us. It is intended to improve the entire area of broadcasting in Canada, private and public. This is the responsibility of parliament. If we really believe in democracy, then it is our responsibility to bring our publicly owned broadcasting corporation under more effec-

tive public control, and provide the regulations which will likewise strengthen and guide private broadcasting. It is all right to protect the C.B.C. from political influence, but the citizens of Canada have been hoodwinked into believing that it must also be protected from public control. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker. The Canadian people are paying for the multimillion dollar operation of a broadcasting network, and it is a denial of the fundamental principles of democracy to refuse them a voice in its affairs. This therefore presents us with one of our most important responsibilities this session, as we deal with this legislation.

Philip Dean in La Presse last year made a very significant statement, a very brief portion of which I would like to repeat here as it relates to the control of the C.B.C. He said—

—that C.B.C. producers must be convinced by management that they—the producers—do not have the right to wield power over shows. C.B.C. producers actually say this should be so. The ultimate power which dictates the shape of the show is content—the facts, the issues—not would-be Fellinis who believe the country owes them large budgets for self-expression.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we view this legislation and study it very carefully from the aspect of the responsibility we have in this regard.

It is my intention to raise the important problem of family life in relation to this broadcasting bill. This is a growing problem, clearly pointed out in the need which the late Governor General Vanier felt to establish the Vanier Institute of the Family, for the purpose of trying to bring the best wisdom to bear on the question of how we can aid and improve family life in this country, not how we can destroy or weaken it.

Tragically the C.B.C. has evidenced a strong tendency on many programs to produce plays, interviews, and in-depth stories which can only be interpreted as undermining family life. Our responsibility in this bill

C.B.C. have a clear mandate to keep our national broadcasting system one which supports this fundamental framework of national existence, not once which undercuts it and the essent'al work of organizations such as the Vanier Institute, the church, family guidance counsellors and the millions of mothers and fathers who bear the responsiblity of raising healthy and happy children equipped to face life with enduring values, with concern for their fellowmen and their country. and whose religious faith is not always under attack by the broadcasting medium which is supported by their own tax dollars.

It is not necessary to bring before this house the details of C.B.C. programming which I believe have transgressed the very framework of sound family life. Two years 2go 80,000 Canad an women, most of them mothers, petitioned the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and parliament to clean up the C.B.C. Signatures were drawn from every province of Canada, and these were just a sample of the grave concern felt by many Canadian parents. May I just quote briefly from that petition:

The future of our country depends on the strength of its homes and the character of the men and women those homes produce. Television and radio have unparalleled power to inspire a nation to build a clean, strong and free society. Instead these media are being exploited to maintain a constant assault on character, to undermine faith in God and respect for law and authority, to destroy sound home afe and the knowledge of right and wrong ... We ask you to end the domination of a ininority who misuse the C.B.C. to spread propaganda or perversion, pornography, free love blasphemy, dope, violence and crime. More and more of our tax money has to be diverted to deal with the increasing social wreckage-

We believe the true function of the C.B.C. is to help us raise a generation with the strength and character and courageous leadership that the opportunities of this age demand.

Mr. Speaker, many thousands of Canadian mothers handed us this challenge. What are we going to do about it? We have enjoyed the tremendous challenge of a confederation year, the amazing inspiration of Expo, which confounded all the cynics and called on man to rise to the highest challenges of God's universe, not to be mired in the cynical, depreciating, mud strewn views of so many of the C.B.C. producers and exponents of weird ideas.

for Canada in portraying the best of our lic have culminated in today's debate. centennial celebrations. I understand that

in centennial programming. Such positive programs and positive attitudes must be retained. What I am concerned about is the small, mischievous or misguided minority who all too often gain control of prime broadcasting hours in order to air controversial and degrading programs which can only be interpreted and understood by viewers as a challenge to the very family and moral fibres which in the past have made this nation of ours great. No better example of that can be found than the plays all too often produced by the C.B.C. In the theatre they are known as the kitchen sink variety. What is their message except the degradation of human character, the break-up of or contempt for family life, and the loss of moral values?

What do most Canadians want in the way of plays? Look at the amazing success of the wonderful family play "Anne of Green Gables." It has been sold out at every performance right across Canada, loved by young and old alike. It is human, family oriented, and gay. It has something of faith, and above all is not degrading to human personality. Canadians want to see more like it regularly on their government sponsored ne'works. Surely scores of Canadian writers produce positive plays about life, and many more would so if they knew the C.B.C. was in the market, encouraging a new and positive kind of drama in this country.

In case there are some who may think that such thinking is old fashioned, or who give the impression that what the majority of Canadians want on C.B.C. is something else, I would like to refer the house at this time to a number of newspaper editorials that deal with this very serious problem. The first quotations deal with the period three years ago, during the initial uproar over the C.B.C. and some of its rotten programming. Perhaps this was the reason for the minister's use of the term rotten, which was justified in many wavs.

At that time the press of the nation was calling on the government to act on its responsibilities toward the C.B.C. Since that time we have moved through royal commissions, special committees, almost endless debates, assertions and questions in parliament, to the point where we must now take In spite of this group I must say that the effective action in legislation. The demands broadcasting corporation has done a fine job of Canadian parents and of the general pub-

Therefore the legislation that this happened due to a highly effective C.B.C. we are considering must have teeth in it to ctop and this type of thing are taxpayers who subsidize this multimillion dollar industry must have some say in the affairs of their public broadcasting facility.

A good example of what I am referring to, Mr. Speaker, was the program last Sunday night between ten and eleven o'clock on abortion, produced by Patrick Watson. To say the least, in the setting that it was aired this film was pornography at its worst, pure unadulterated evil watched by millions of families, by children, and by young girls serving as babysitters. Was this a program for young girls? Was it not possible to discuss the controversial issue of legalized abortion in a rational and reasonable way without showing everything, including the screaming of a hysterical girl undergoing an abortion operation?

Another point in question concerns national unity. The Prime Minister has said this is our most vital and urgent problem. Yet last night a great deal of time was given to René Lévesque and his radical separatist views uttered in Toronto on the week end. No mention was made of the spectacular world week end in Edmonton, nor was there mention of the remarkable reception given the Governor General by his local townspeople, boyhood friends and schoolmates in Red Deer and Lacombe. Neither was there mention made in prelude of the centennial celebration of parliament which took place yesterday.

The public demand for more effective control of broadcasting is not only from parents, from taxpayers and from the representatives of the people, including the majority of the members of this house. It is shared by every aspect of Canadian life, including the press. The following quotations from the press, which I have kept down through the months, are just a sample of public opinion as recorded in the English press regarding the C.B.C., beginning theree years ago when the government at last took action which has resulted in the present legislation. I may add that the French press has been just as outspoken and just as firm. The Vancouver Province, on October 30. 1964. said:

Now that the Pearson government admits its responsibility from the C.B.C., the taxpayer can look to Ottawa to rescue the C.B.C. from the curious crew that seem to have taken over so many C.B.C. productions—

The odd crew took over because C.B.C. management abdicated its responsibility to direct and control—

Before the C.B.C. drifts any further into the strange experiments of some of its employees, before it becomes regarded solely as a profitable

hang-out for wispy bearded beatnixs, impersonating genuinely creative talent, the government will have to get busy and put the C.B.C.'s house in order.

The Calgary Herald on October 29, 1964, said:

There is little doubt that, on occasion, some of the "far-out" employees of the public broadcasting system in Canada have been misusing the tremendous power given them. There have been quite unnecessary affronts to the noral code and the ethical values on which western civilization and society are being built.

The Owen Sound Sun-Times of October 23, 1964 said:

It must be increasingly evident to C.B.C. management, and to the government, that action must be evidently menace the basis of society. It would be, of course, much better if that discipline comes from within the crown communication system. But if such is not the case, it is difficult to see how the government can continue to ignore what is quite apparently offensive to a great many Canadians... it is quite evident that many of those in charge of C.B.C. programming are supporters of a much different way of life than that which has been accepted by Canadians in general. And it is also apparent that way is bent toward the licentiousness which has brought the decay of past civilizations.

Then this editorial ended with these words:

Its propaganda should be aimed at the promotion of the good way of life which has marked this nation's history to date, rather than in undermining it.

The next is an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa Journal of June 10, 1964. Here the editor discusses the remarks of Dr. Wilder Penfield which were made before the Vanier Conference on Family Life at Carleton university. The editorial states:

Dr. Penfield dared suggest—and he was applauded—that we should come to some conclusions about the control of mass media so that liberty is not prostituted to licence. Thus a plea for control or even censorship comes not from the old familiar places, but from a man who epitomizes in Canada the most advanced thinking of the scientific mind ...control...if it is to come in a democratic society...must be imposed by an aroused public insisting that vulgarity shall not be rewarded and degradation shall not be upheld.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on with quotations of this type but time does not permit. These quotations are just a sampling of public opinion regarding the C.B.C. as recorded in the English press. Here, then, is the challenge the people of Canada have hurled at them in no uncertain terms. We must not fail the ordinary citizen, the fathers and mothers of this nation who need and want our support in their everyday tasks of family building. The airwaves have been full

of the same kind of tragic programming since that time. One could support my argument with almost endless protests that C.B.C. programs which are good and worthy are obliterated by the bad During these past years we have learned more about the problem. The presence of men and women in positions of program responsibility who spenly want to use this great instrument to divide the country and to promote their own peculiar ideologies and personal feelings has been well documented before this house by other speakers from both sides.

We might take the matter of the deliberate promotion of drugs like LSD and marijuana. Over the past two years there have been a series of t.v. and radio programs which have stressed the pleasures of taking LSD for mind expansion and other purposes, supposedly all forward-looking and good.

What do we know about 1.s.d.? We are told that it causes a breakdown in chromosomes leading to deformed bables, and almost universally responsible medical opinion warns of the dangers of the misuse of this drug. At least one tragic suicide has taken place in Canada owing to l.s.d. and yet, without adequate research or without giving proper warning, C.B.C. producers have placed before cur youngsters programs designed to appeal to youth in which the Ginsbergs and their ilk have told them that this is a good thing. On one French language network program last year, a popular interview show at a prime time, a young reporter told how he took l.s.d. in New York and described its wonders and delights. This same program suggested that it ought to be available without restriction in Canadian grocery and drug stores.

Canadians should stand up in protest against this type of programming. Producers like these should be held accountable in the courts for the death of this Toronto boy and for the wreckage of so many lives.

The report of the Aird commission to parliament in 1929, from which our present national system grew, contains certain conclusions relevant and important to Canada today. It recognized several dangers. The first was that broadcasting should be carried out in the interest of Canadian listeners and in the national interest. There is no reference here to the interests of producers. Second, it recognized that where religious broadcasting is allowed there should be regulations prohibiting statements of a controversial nature.

It also recognized that broadcasting of political matters should be carefully restricted under arrangements mutually agreed upon by all political parties.

I wish to close with a reference to the frequent attacks on religion which one hears regularly on the C.B.C. and on other programs. This has occurred so often that one can only assume it is a systematic and planned operation. It appears to be some kind of a planned project by a few who seem to work from behind the scenes. This whole aspect" of public broadcasting now falls directly on our shoulders. In view of the flagarant misure of the C.B.C. in the area of religion, I will also be proposing an amendment to protect us against such activities which set Canadians against Canadians, church against church and faith against those of no faith.

I am strongly of the opinion that Canada's national broadcasting system has come under the influence of a few who are determined to undermine the morals, break down family units and, yes, even the political thinking of Canadians, not through the open forum or normal political activity but rather from inside the t.v. studio. I am also of the opinion that these preconceived opinions of a very small minority, vocal and repetitious as they are, constitute a threat to our liberty.

Others in this house have touched upon certain flagrant failings of our broadcasting system in promoting separatism, division, extreme left-wing politics and extreme left-wing foreign affairs positions. I would endorse all of these accusations against the same smaller group who attack family line. It is from this viewpoint that I speak.

After months and years of discussion by committees and royal commissions the legislation we have before us, while it improves the broadcasting picture immensely, is still without adequate teeth to bring this all-important aspect of our present modern life under the proper supervision and control of parliament and the people whose tax dollars support it. This is why I have been moved to speak as a parent, to speak on behalf of the families of this nation who are determined and want to raise their children in that kind of life and to be that kind of responsible citizens this nation has had in the past and needs in the future.

#### CRIMINAL CODE

AND LIFE IMPRISONMENT

Hon. L. T. Pennell (Solicitor General) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-168, vote now on the abolition of capital punishto amend the Criminal Code.

Speaker, first of all I wish to express my private member's bill to abolish the death personal respect for the Solicitor General penalty. I believe it would be more logical (Mr. Pennell) in the position which he has and responsible for the government to enunciated today. His sincerity and the evi- enforce the law as it was upheld last year in dence of his conviction are such that the vote instead of announcing its intention although I differ with his conclusion I do not to introduce its own legislation for the abolifor one moment question the motives that tion of the death penalty. In fact I believe moved him to introduce this bill and to speak there have been several commutations since as eloquently as he has today.

duction of Bill C-168, a bill which is a com-parliament at that time. promise with last year's bill in that it recom- (5:30 p.m.) mends capital punishment for those who kill policemen and prison guards. The obvious Herald of April 22 which provides further reason for retaining capital punishment in substantive reasons for this argument: these specified instances must be that the minister believes it has some deterrent effect. If the minister believes this, then it logically follows that capital punishment must also have a deterrent value in other instances. To changed to life imprisonment. those who are thinking of changing their chooses to extend its powers of commutation in position from the one they took in the vote last year I suggest with all sincerity that if they had any doubts whether or not there was any deterrent value in capital punishment, then this bill is evidence of it because if it has a deterrent value in one respect then prisonment is ordained. I cannot see how anyone can be so illogical as to assume that it might not have a deterrent value in other respects.

Surely the minister must agree that if it is necessary to protect the lives of policemen, wardens and prison guards through the retention of capital punishment, then it automatically follows that it is necessary also to protect girls killed in sex murders. What is the difference between a policeman who is murdered in a bank robbery and a girl who is raped and murdered by a sex maniac? I cannot see the differentiation which this bill automatically makes. Also I find it strange that the minister should leave himself open to the charge of a lack of logic. Surely any member of this house who questions the validity of capital punishment must be convinced that there is a deterrent simply by the negative logic of this bill, if for no other reason.

There is further lack of logic contained in the bill. It is interesting to note that while the bill retains capital punishment in certain specified areas and eliminates it in others, it has no effect on sections 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71 of the National Defence Act. It is a fact that section 66 of the National Defence Act makes the death penalty mandatory for certain offences against the state. That being the case, this bill is completely inadequate and to my way of thinking should not really be considered by the house as a serious attempt to solve the problem of capital punishment.

There is another point in the bill which seems to be strangely illogical. Certainly we have departed from tradition so far as the parliamentary system is concerned in that we have before us in this session a bill similar to, even though it is a compromise with, the bill that we voted on last year. As I interpret parliamentary tradition, when a bill is turned down by parliament it is not usually introduced again during the life of the same parliament. Therefore I do not understand the reasoning behind the introduction of this bill there have been 27 commutations since this

when we have been told that there are very DIENDMENTS RESPECTING DEATH SENTENCE important and urgent pieces of legislation which must be dealt with before the end of the session. In fact I can see no justification whatever for calling another parliamentary ment. After all, we had such a vote a year Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. ago and parliament decisively rejected the the government was given a very clear indi-There is a paradox, however, in the intro-cation by parliament of what was the will of

I refer to an editorial in the Calgary

This is shocking and inexcusable government conduct. It constitutes an abuse of the cabinet prerogative of commuting death sentences. Occasions, of course, do arise when extraordinary cir-cumstances dictate that a death penalty should be Ottawa, however, every case.

In so doing, it renders meaningless those sections of the Criminal Code which differentiate between capital (premeditated) murder and non-capital (unpremediated) murder. For the former, the death penalty is directed. For the latter, life im-

The result has been a mockery of our courts and of the Criminal Code. The government, which has been deliberately breaking the law of the land in this matter, now wants legislation which, in effect, will provide retroactive endorsation of its policy regarding the death penalty over the past three and one half years.

I think that this argument is very sound, Mr. Speaker. At least, it seems to me that the government is placing priority in the wrong place when it takes part of the time remaining in this session for discussion of a bill which is really not sound or in order, as it deals with a topic that was turned down by this parliament last session.

There is another aspect of this bill which disturbs me. There is supposed to be a free vote on this measure. The minister was very careful to explain that in his introductory remarks this afternoon. However, this is a government bill sponsored by a cabinet minister. It seems to me that members of the government are placed under definite duress in respect of their vote. I should like to hear the minister state very clearly that if this bill is defeated it will not be regarded in any way as a vote of non-confidence in the government or in himself and that those who vote contrary to the minister's opinion will not be under any pressure to follow the lead the minister has established in introducing the bill. Whether or not we can fully agree with the minister's definition of a free vote, it seems to me that if he really wanted to retain the confidence of the house in connection with this measure he would have had the bill introduced in the same way as the resolution was introduced last year. Certainly I find myself disturbed about this because it seems to me there is more behind the scenes than we see from the front.

There is another point to which I have already referred briefly, the fact that we have de facto abolition of capital punishment at the present time. If my figures are correct,

government took office. In fact, the sentences imposed for the murder of prison guards have been commuted as have the sentences of these convicted of the murder of policemen. As we are asked to support this bill, then we are also being told that the actions of the government in the last several years in commuting the sentences of those convicted of murder of prison guards or policemen were wrong. There is something unsound about this; it is not logical as I understand it.

There is another factor which is very interesting at the present time. I refer to the situation in Great Britain. A great deal has been made of the fact that the British parliament two years ago passed a bill providing for a five-year provisional abolition of capital punishment. Many members during the debate last year, and I imagine they will again this year, said that this was an example by a progressive nation which we should follow. However, a strange report has come out of Britain written by Canadian newspaperman Don McGillivray of the Southam news service. It was published in the November 7 issue of all Southam papers, including the Ottawa Citizen. The article reads in part:

Britain's five-year experiment with the complete abolition of capital punishment is two years old on Wednesday and aiready a petition to bring back hanging is gathering 5,000 signatures a week—

-the campaigners for renewal of the death penalty claim the murder rate and incidence of violent crime have both risen since abolition.

Home Secretary Roy Jenkins-Britain's Minister of Justice and Police-disputes the statistical connection. But estimates made by Jenkins' own ministry shows 35 capital murders last year and 32 the year before, compared with an average of 20.5 a year in the previous eight years, when a limited death penalty was in effect.

Without taking the time of the house to read the whole article, I point out that Mr. McGillivray closes by saying:

In the latest Gallup poll on the subject, 56 per cent of those questioned thought the murder rate had risen since abolition, compared with 8 per cent who thought it had gone down.

This is the evidence of what has happened in Great Britain. Mention has been made once or twice during the debate today that evidence is some states of the United States seems to indicate that the murder rate had gone down following abolition. On the other hand, one can find more states in which there has been abolition where the statistics will prove that the murder rate has gone up than those where the statistics will prove that it has gone down. My point is not to rehash what was said in last year's debate so far as statistics are concerned. Nevertheless, I think we should be very careful when we consider certain statistics which are used by those arguing in favour of abolition.

There is one other point I wish to mention. We have a responsibility, as those who make the laws of the land, to consider each problem in all its aspects. One of the aspects of murder and the abolition of capital punishment for those who are guilty of premeditated murder about which little is said concerns those who are the victims of murderers. Our crime rate has been rising very rapidly, and we are extremely concerned about this. We should be concerned likewise about those who are the victims of criminals, particularly of murderers.



Police Chief Ralph Booth of Vancouver made a very significant statement in this regard, and T should like to quote part of it as it appeared in the Vancouver newspapers:

—the war on crime can be successfully fought only if crime victims are compensated for their injuries. He favours legislation authorizing establishment of a board, similar to the workmen's compensation board, having the power to compensate victims of criminal activity.

"We are spending millions of dollars on rehabilitating criminals but nothing is being done for their victims," Chief Booth said.

"The police know only too well that their success in fighting crime depends upon the co-operation of the public".

He said many persons are reluctant to aid policemen, in difficulty because of personal danger and the lack of compensation.

"So often when citizens do help police officers in trouble and are injured as a result of helping the police, they have no way of recovering damages for injuries.

#### • (5:40 p.m.)

Then he goes on to deal with the problem of caring for those who are the victims of criminals, the rehabilitation of their families and compensation for the damage that has been done.

I do not intend to go further, Mr. Speaker. I believe the points I have enunciated are very strong refutations of the validity of Bill No. C-168. In fact, I think the whole basis for its presentation to the house, in view of the points I have already outlined, is illogical and we should not be dealing with it.

In closing, I should like to say a few words on the principle involved. What I have to say in this regard is not much different from what I said in the debate last year. Certainly we must be concerned about crime prevention. Is it hardly reasonable to campaign strongly for the possibility of the redemption of murderers, most of whom have a long record of violent crime, while millions of pliable minds watch men and women being stabbed, shot, strangled, drowned, poisoned and maltreated in almost every possible way

as often as 20 times a day on television? If those who lead the movement for abolition are really concerned about the sacredness of life they should do something about the disrespect shown for life on television programs and in movies which do so much to influence youthful minds in this country.

It appears that with a decrease in the severity of punishment for criminals there comes a corresponding increase in crime and the suffering of the innocent. In recent years, for example, the number of policemen murdered by felons has been larger than the number of felons executed by the state. It is argued that the administration of capital punishment is attended by many abuses. This may be so. The same can be said of the administration of Christian churches. Do we, therefore, eliminate the Christian churches? No, we try to eliminate the abuse. The same approach applies to the abuses of capital punishment.

Abolitionists make much of the loss of innocent lives through the death penalty. They overlook the fact, however, that more innocent lives have been lost through non-executed criminals who remained alive to commit more crimes than through executed non-criminals.

It has been said that the science of renology as well as the improvements in standards of social work and law enforcement have advanced to the point where society is pro-

tion of capital punishment. It is true that we have more effective police forces and more thorough rehabilitation of criminals. However, of the 14 states in the United States which abolished capital punishment prior to 1962, 8 have reinstituted it. Penology does give more protection now than formerly against criminals committing crimes in the future, but it cannot protect against persons committing crime in the first instance.

Every one of us, Mr. Speaker, still reflects the image of God. To murder a man is still an outrage, an outrage against God the Creator, against man, against the victim, against the victim's loved ones, against society and against the institution of government. Because life is sacred, life must be protected against maltreatment and murder. Policemen charged with enforcing the laws of the state must have the right to kill in self-defence or in the interest of law enforcement. The state must punish severely, at times with death, those who wilfully disregard the sacredness of the lives of others. I believe this is necessary for the general good of society.

-30-

ALLE

On
Mr.
Speak
right!
that Y
this h
bear :
and co
result
ber for
violate
of eve
should
er any

questio membe accepte

hon. m

tegrity

position

Mr.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS

ALLEGED VIOLATION OF OATH BY MEMBER FOR LAPOINTE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that Your Honour and all other members of this house have solemnly sworn on oath to bear allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen and country and in view of the fact that as a result of his seditious actions the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) not only has violated his oath but has placed the honour of every member of the house in question, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether any action has been initiated against the hon. member for Lapointe and, if not, do integrity and loyalty still have relevance to our position as public servants?

**Mr.** Speaker: Order. The hon. member's question is a form of reflection upon another member and certainly is one which cannot be accepted.