Speech from the Throne

country. New provisions with regard to income security may appear too generous to some, insufficient to others, but no matter, it is the general good that is sought.

Even though Canada may have more quality housing starts than almost all other countries in the world, it will always be said that it is not enough. This government has chosen to do its duty, all of its duty. Accordingly, it deserves to be encouraged and congratulated. Things cannot always be perfect. The government accepts criticism, but this criticism must be constructive. It will have been noted, doubtless, that since the beginning of this session, for lack of more serious subjects, the opposition refers only to issues such as the Geoffroy case or the alleged intention of removing the term "Royal" from the designation of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), toward the end of last week, ansered these accusations as he was touring northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather not linger too long on this subject, but I can asy that the government's achievements arouse little enthusiasm on our opponents' part. This is understandable. It is even understandable that a certain part of the press, confusing the right to criticize with the duty to criticize, did not aspare it its reproaches. Fortunately, Canada has more objective and detached observers.

Reviewing, much as I have just done, the action of the government for the past few years, the *Journal de Montréal* on February 14 last published an article which stated in part:

In these particularly difficult times, the government remains vigilant and active. It was able to solve problems overcome crises and it works more than ever to improve the living conditions of all

It could not be stated better. But if the value of this evidence is suspected, perhaps one will be more impressed by that of *Le Devoir*, a paper which is not very sympathetic to the government, as is well known. In an article by its Ottawa correspondent who also reviewed the legislative action of the government, it was stated in conclusion:

The government ensured the passing of many reformist acts of great importance, including the monumental tax reform bill and it succeeded as never before in keeping the attention of Canadians focussed on the central parliamentary institution.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that some measure of parliamentary reform, vehemently opposed by the opposition, will ensure that Parliament will now be able to act faster and better in the numerous fields in which it has to take action.

Nevertheless there is some contradiction in the fact that the very people who never stop asking that the government interfere in everything are not very competent themselves. Indeed, they spend their time reproaching the government with its slowness, its mismanagement and its idleness. But those are the very people who resist the most vehemently all attempts made by Parliament to facilitate sensible discussion of measures that often are vital for the public interest. The Canadian people are not taken in by that ambiguity and they will not believe that the government has trampled down the rights of Parliament, if I may use an expression often used by hon. members of the opposition. On the contrary, they are grateful to it for

having taken measures to allow the representatives of the people to express themselves in an absolutely democratic way, that is in giving them the opportunity to take a vote on the proposals submitted to them.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not, like previous speakers, pay tribute to the hon. member who moved the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, as well as to the seconder. Both deserve much from their country. They have shown themselves worthy of the confidence which their electors had put in them, and I am convinced that both realize that a brilliant future lies afead of them.

To end these few remarks, may I, Mr. Speaker, call on all members of the opposition or the government to work together hand in hand. Let us work for the increased well-being of this country, and instead of condemning everything, sowing hatred, as some are trying to do, let us co-operate. As for those who would criticize us and try to get ahead by destroying reputations, may I remind them that "He who sows the wind shall reap the whirlwind".

• (1210)

[English]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, as I participate in a Throne Speech debate for the first time, even though I have sat here as a member for six years and would like to think that I may sit here longer although that will be left to the electorate in the not too distant future, I suppose, I enter the debate with two basic thoughts that I want to present to the House. I believe they underline part of the problem in Canada, and in a philosophical way I have entitled them "The Paradoxes of the Prime Minister".

After listening to the last speaker refer to criticism and then immediately talk about hate, and accepting the sincerity of the views he expressed, I hope that no one after listening to what I have to say will suggest that one can equate criticism, either constructive or negative, if one can divide criticism in that semantic form, with any hint of hate, prejudice or bigotry.

As I sit as a Member of Parliament and hear questions concerning Canada discussed, our constitution, the monarchy and our parliamentary form of government, and then on television see the problems which exist to the south of us, I believe that those to the south of us at times have more to be thankful for than we in this country. Although they have problems and divisions I personally believe there is more frank discussion of those problems. Sides are taken passionately in an effort to solve their dilemma. We in Canada have a character blended from the two founding races with an infusion of the blood of many other peoples. We always seem to opt for compromise, for the easy way out, and avoid the basic issues confronting the land.

• (1220)

When the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) ascended the throne, so to speak, assumed the mantle of leadership of his party and fought an election, he appeared to speak frankly and realistically about the problems that face Canada. His frankness was stimulating. I believe there was hope in all parties and certainly among many of the younger people of Canada. People felt that at last,