

*The Address—Mr. Cafik*

federalism when no one knows what it is. It is obvious that some people do, but there are far too many who do not. We have to do something positive to change this situation.

I think, also, that in our schools and on our radio and television broadcasts there is a tendency to oversimplify very difficult problems, such as pollution. I have been to schools where people cannot understand why we do not immediately outlaw cars because they pollute the air, or why we do not outlaw anyone who puts any kind of sewage into the Great Lakes.

**An hon. Member:** Good idea.

**Mr. Cafik:** It is a good idea. But if you did not think of all the consequences of such action you would find yourself standing up to your forehead in the very thing you want to prevent. So we have to do something, and these are urgent problems. But it does not really help anyone if we speak to a group of little kids and tell them these things can be solved tomorrow morning, and show them photographs of sewage running into the Great Lakes instead of discussing all the relevant problems surrounding pollution. They want us to do away with pollution and do away with cars, and yet unemployment is too high. If we did these things in the way they have in mind, probably the vast majority of people in North America would be out of work. I think that it does not really serve any useful purpose to frustrate our youth by giving them half-baked answers to very complicated issues, and I think it is doing them a disservice to try to do so.

I think, also, that one of the causes of the difficulty—I am not speaking of the difficulties that we are having with the FLQ, but these are all things as lead up to the condition that makes it possible—is that we as politicians are far too political. I think that sometimes, if not all the time, we should put this country and its unity ahead of political ambition or political expediency. Far too often I have seen, as I am sure we all have, people stand up on political platforms and say, "What has my opponent ever done for Canada?" or they have said, "The two old parties have never done anything".

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cafik:** Or they have said, "The NDP are a bunch of communists". This is not what we should say. Let us be responsible and talk about the things that they really are. If we keep knocking down our neighbour and our fellow politician, surely we are only causing a condition of animosity within our society. Perhaps we think these things are humorous or are not important. I do not believe any one of us has not gone campaigning, knocked on doors and tried to explain who he was, and then run into the odd person who seems to be motivated more by hate and distrust than anything else because he belongs to a different party.

They say, "You are no good. Only the NDP are any good," or if they are Liberals they say the Conservatives

[Mr. Cafik.]

are no good, or whatever it may be. I do not think we are beyond blame for this condition, and I do not think it is a very useful attitude or a very useful feeling to foster and spread throughout Canada. Something has to be done to create proper conditions for the development of national unity rather than national disunity.

In an age of mass communications I submit that no democracy can survive unless these tools are used, not for political or partisan purposes but to inform and involve our people in the democratic process. In this field we have failed miserably.

I believe that Members of Parliament should be given the facilities and the means to truly involve the people within their areas. Unless we do, one cannot blame people for feeling alienated from us and from everything we represent. To achieve this end I believe that every Member of Parliament, certainly in the federal House and perhaps in provincial Houses, should have an office in his own riding, paid for by the government of Canada or by the government of that province, so they could communicate with the people they represent. I do not think the cost would be very great, because there are many public buildings in every riding and I believe they should be made available to those who represent the people, so they may represent them more effectively and learn their views and feelings regardless of their political persuasion.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I also believe that Members of Parliament should be given adequate staff to carry out their work in participatory democracy. I remember saying about a year and a half ago that if the people of my riding participated any more, I would have to shovel it out the window.

**An hon. Member:** What?

**Mr. Cafik:** I had a great many letters coming into my office because I encouraged people to write and let me know their views. But there was so much mail that I could not possibly do anything with it when I got it. When you say that you want participation, you are doing a disservice if you do not supply facilities to members of this House so they may do something with the participation when it arrives.

I believe we ought to have proper, adequate staff and quarters in these buildings so that we can deal with involvement by the people in our riding. In addition, we must have two-way communication with our ridings. We all know how hopeless are the facilities in that regard. From the House of Commons we can telephone to our ridings, but if a member happens to be in his riding—where he should be from time to time, if not each weekend—he cannot communicate with the people except out of his own pocket; he has to pay for these calls himself. I do not mind, but many people who become members of this House cannot afford it. I would like to give an example of this. Last Easter weekend I was in my riding and had a telephone call from a person who said that his daughter was in jail. I will not name the place because the people involved may read this speech. The daughter was in jail in the United States. Later