

*Canada Labour Code*

Francophone living in Prince George or, for that matter, the lone Anglophone in Rivière-du-Loup. To what extent is it incumbent upon the state to fund bilingual facilities to permit these individuals their claims to do business with the Government in their own language?

• (1550)

Let me make my point explicit. I am not referring to the language question only because the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River referred to it in the previous debate. There is a principle common here to the issues raised by his proposed amendment. In the case of the minority language question, the issue, as I see it, is to what extent the collectivity should be taxed to provide linguistic services to minorities, that is to say, to provide them their individual rights. It is a clear question of the collective or majority right not to be taxed against the individual right to receive services. There is the *quid pro quo*. Obviously there is no one right answer. I would not profess to have the only answer in Canada or in the world. I put forth my views for the consideration of the House.

As in all arguments over who gets what, the final choice will probably be made by a process of compromise. No doubt such a process is unsatisfying to the ideologues and extremists who would attempt to discuss the question in the absolute terms of rights, but it is precisely this sort of compromise that prevents countries from becoming unstuck. One great writer wrote at one time that the art of governing is in itself the art of compromise or the art of trying to move a country in the direction that the country itself wants to and should move, this by its own analyses.

The same arguments apply in the case of compulsory trade union membership and the payment of dues. The Hon. Member referred to this matter on three different occasions in his speech today. As one attempts to discuss these issues in terms of fundamental rights, one is inevitably thrown into endless and sometimes confused debate over the relative rights of the collectivity, meaning the group, versus the individual. Evidently the Hon. Member's failure to draw out the implications of the question posed is, in my view, an acknowledgement of the weakness of such an approach. However, since these are the grounds upon which the representative of Prince George-Peace River has chosen to base his arguments, we will have to take a closer look at them despite the unlikelihood of being able to draw any fundamental and definite conclusions.

At one point in his speech he asked rhetorically:

Why do I have to be compelled to belong to my union?

He asked that again today. At another point he maintained that in West Germany workers "cannot be compelled to join" unions and stated:

The right of the worker in an industry is that if he does not like what the union does he should not have to pay dues.

I believe I am quoting him correctly.

**Mr. Oberle:** Not at all.

**Mr. Parent:** The Hon. Member says that I am not quoting him correctly. I tell him that this passage was taken directly from his speech on February 6, 1979.

The last statement concluded a paragraph of argument in which the Hon. Member attempted to turn around the cogent reasoning of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in a previous debate on the amendment. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre is not present in the Chamber, but he argued that the amendment, if applied to other conditions, could result in the claim, that "Because I am not a Liberal", or for that matter a Conservative, "and I do not agree with everything this Government does"—and he was referring to the Government of the day—"I should not have to pay taxes". By some bizarre and unexplained leap of fancy, the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River said that the position of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre illustrated his argument that "the union power in this country puts itself on an equal footing with the power of this institution and the power of Government".

Whether or not there might be any truth in the Hon. Member's claim that unions believe that "if I do not agree with what the Government is doing, I do not have to pay taxes", it would appear to be a statement completely irrelevant to the issue under discussion unless it is to illustrate once again that the Hon. Member, with all respect, is not at all concerned with the rights of the individual and that it is union solidarity which his amendment attacks directly.

If the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre will excuse me, I will attempt to explain the intent of his analogy to the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River. If I understand the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre correctly, he was referring to an old Conservative principle. What a disgrace that Liberals and socialists should have to lecture Tories on Conservative principles. I do so only with great deference. The principle is that once born into society we derive the benefits of society involuntarily. We could not live and develop without these benefits. However involuntarily we receive them, we are bound by our debt to society. When a child is born into Canadian society, he becomes a Canadian. He accepts all the rights of a Canadian and, by the same token, he accepts all the duties of a Canadian.

We discharge the debt referred to under the social contract by obeying society's laws. Those who seek to evade their obligations, we brand as criminals. Hence, whether or not we agree with the specific acts of a particular Government, our general debt to society is so overwhelming that we have no choice but to submit to these acts until, by the democratic process, we have the opportunity to seek redress. To act otherwise would be the limit of irrationality. General disobedience to the laws of established authority would lead only to anarchy, where the war of all against all in this state of nature would render life, in Hobbes' terms, "nasty, poor, solitary, brutish and short".