

*Non-Profit Corporations*

in some of the eastern European countries. The over-regulation and over-power of government is such that the people of those nations feel, unless their governments make them perform some specific duty by law, that they have no incentive of their own volition.

Personally I feel I can speak with some authority on the concept of volunteerism. I spent ten years of my life working with the 4-H Club movement in the province of Alberta. In some of the larger towns in that province the majority of students attending high school were from urban centres, yet the presidents of student unions were usually farm boys. This was not by accident. It was because they came out of the 4-H movement which existed on the backbone of parenting and volunteers. People in the ranching districts of the southern section of the province drove an average of more than 60 miles per member in order for their children to attend the club. They believed that their children were taught something about conducting meetings, public speaking, debating, accounting, looking after animals, and most particularly, responsibility.

I should like to share a recent experience with the House. I am sure three government members share my concern. On a recent trip to the Middle East we visited with the Canadian contingent on the Golan Heights and in Cyprus. Our soldiers there do not know or desire the eight-hour day. Their work is the limit of the task. Whenever their soldiering duties are done for the day, interestingly enough, the vast majority of them are involved in self-help projects.

We noted with great interest that the other battalions serving in the Middle East were of the very strong opinion that Canadian soldiers were favoured with Canadian money over and above other contingents. Also, there was a belief that the United Nations favoured them with a greater degree of money. The truth of the matter was that Canadian soldiers were favoured no more in an economic sense than others. They were favoured because they were blessed with the ingenuity and initiative to go ahead with self-help projects such as developing their own recreation areas, planting grass and trees, and building around themselves something which was very beautiful and a home away from home. In striking contrast, some of the countries just across the rolls of wire fence provided army tents which were sheltered from the wind only by bombed out buildings requiring repair for approximately five or six years.

Everything comes down to the concept of Maslow's hierarchy of human needs: once a human being has met the basic needs of food, clothing and shelter, feels the sense of having been loved and the capacity to be loving, he strives for a sense of self-esteem, willingness, and a desire to achieve.

I find the objectives of Bill S-4 commendable, but when I look at the particular wording of the bill, I become very, very concerned. This bill contains approximately 242 clauses. It is a weighty manuscript to place before any association which operates within the concept of volunteerism. These associations operate because they want to help the people around them, yet now they will be burdened by the heavy weight of government. They will require the assistance of legal people to sift through and comprehend this piece of legislation. The nation will not

[Mr. Malone.]

achieve greatness by the government regulating associations with the ambition to attain achievements which otherwise would not be forthcoming.

I should like to refer to some of the disincentives which exist in eastern European countries. The fact of the matter is that initiative has been destroyed in those areas. Their populations have lost the zest for life which is a natural human instinct. Effectively the bill kills the volunteer sector of our society. Free society needs and must have a free notion of volunteers. Volunteer organizations should not be required to have red-tape computers to thresh through all the material placed before them by government. Not only are the 242 clauses dangerous because they are numerous, they are dangerous because some clauses raise considerable concern for all Canadians, particularly people who believe in free democracy.

● (1552)

In the 700 years the parliamentary system has been in existence, and since the concept of that Mother of Parliaments at the time of King John, we have removed the notion that we are subjects, and now appreciate the fact that we are citizens. Freedom of speech ought not to be taken away in any light form.

I should like to put forward some examples of the things in this bill which create rather grave concerns. I am sure there are many organizations across the country which have great concerns about some of the aspects we find in Bill S-4. The bill contains an indication that churches will lose their voluntary status if what they do is interpreted in any way as being political. Without making reference to any particular faith, one simply has to ask what a church is if it is not an institution to attend to moral questions in a society? Without giving any of my own feelings in this regard at this time, I would simply ask why a church should not be able to express an opinion on capital punishment, on any issue involving law and order, on abortion, on mercy killing, on women's rights or on child abuse, without an assumption being made that in so doing the church is becoming political in its intent and should lose its voluntary status?

Any bill before the House which can be interpreted as having that intent would lend itself to the destruction of the very backbone and fabric of democracy. What we must attempt always to preserve is not just the concept that we regulate the society in which we live but, more important, the incentive of people, wherever they may be within a country, to create a society that reaches greatness because of the ideas, energies, and imagination of the people.

Churches are not institutions to be slighted by legislation that would take away some of their basic rights to speak out on any subject in respect of which, in a self-proclaimed manner, they feel it is their duty to speak. It is an affront to the concept of freedom of speech to have such a clause within a legislative measure.

What of many of the other volunteer organizations in the country and their feelings in this regard? Let me refer to fish and game associations as an example. Are they not to have the