

stretch I would have time to explain how people are hurt rather badly by the technological age but I shall, hopefully, do this on another occasion.

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

Today, of course, is a sad day in the history of this country, just as the last few days have been. Before beginning my remarks in connection with the Speech from the Throne, I think it is only fitting that I should say a few words about Mr. Pierre Laporte. I believe all Canadians owe him a great deal because in a very special way he gave his life in order to protect the freedom and rights of all people in Canada. I think we owe him a great debt. I hope that tomorrow, on the day of his funeral, all Canadians will take the opportunity to express our debt of gratitude to him and to his family. I wish also to express my most sincere sorrow to Mrs. Laporte and her family.

The tragic events of the last few days I think remind all of us that law is the basis of democracy. Today this point is often forgotten. Without a society based upon law we must have the other alternative, a society based upon people. A society based upon people and upon their whims and feelings from time to time is really a society based upon tyranny, because if the person in charge should not be a man of goodwill, or even if he should be, we are subject to the caprice of his views and feelings.

We in this chamber and, I hope, all Canadians realize the very purpose of a democratic society is to formulate and pronounce laws for the benefit and common advantage of all people. Unless we abide by and have some respect for these laws, society itself is in great peril. It is true that all of us in a democratic society have the right at any time to advocate changes in our laws and adjustments to those laws so that they may constantly be up to date and improved and thereby we may have a better, freer society.

We must always remember, however, that untrammelled freedom is not freedom at all. Law, by its very nature, is restrictive in one way or another. There is law such as the criminal law which involves our following norms of conduct which are not acceptable to the whole society and which certainly, by its nature, is restrictive. Even permissive laws, or laws which would grant benefits of some kind to people, impose obligations. In such cases it is necessary that the people fill out forms to the letter of the law in order to comply. This breeds red tapes, bureaucracy and all kinds of unpleasant things. But there really is no alternative. We must have a society based upon laws.

To many people in our society, laws on the surface appear to be a burden of oppression. I believe that unless people in a democratic society have a strong, effective voice in the formation of those laws they can be interpreted as oppressive measures. Participation of the people in a democracy is not a political gimmick; it is a necessity.

The Address—Mr. Cafik

If we do not allow people to become more and more deeply involved in the issues of this House, then in the long run we will create conditions which cause anarchy. We must find a way to reach the people of our country and give them a genuine hand to assist us in the operations of Parliament, otherwise our system will not and cannot survive. That was not true in days gone by, but in our age of rising expectations Canadians are more sophisticated and demand more. We also owe them more. We must allow them an effective means of communicating with us, so there will be an effective two-way street between we whom they look upon as the governors, as it were, and those who elect us to office.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Alienation between the governed and government has been increasing at an alarming rate in the last few years. Consider for a moment the attitude of many people in this country. I am not saying that they are wrong; I am saying that the attitudes which I will outline should warn us that there is an urgent need for something to be done. First of all, "politics" is a bad word, not only in Canada but perhaps throughout the western world. Why is it a bad word? Why is politics not an honourable profession? Surely it really is, but why is it not viewed as such by the people in the street, those who vote us into office? Far too many believe that politicians are dishonest and are only out for personal gain. Far too many of them feel that politicians do not really care, that we are not interested in anything outside this chamber, that there is not much point in communicating with us because we will not do anything about it anyway.

I believe that in our homes and in our schools this attitude is indirectly and unconsciously fostered. I think it is not uncommon to find parents—I know this is true because I have done it myself and I am sure all of us, if we are honest, have done it at one time or another—talking about local provincial or federal politician and saying, "Ah, he does not care." We so often imply a great disrespect for people who are trying to serve the public.

Is it any wonder that parents who have done this year in and year out in a very subtle and unconscious way find their children take their words quite seriously and grow up to have no respect at all for the institutions that we all know are the basis of everything good in this country? In this time when we have such unrest in the country, I think people should sit back and reflect upon the example that we set for each other and our own children.

I have spoken in nearly all the schools in my riding and I have been shocked and amazed at the lack of understanding students have of what goes on in this country. But more than that, I am absolutely astounded that those whose very profession it is to teach political science often know very little more than the pupils they teach. It is amazing to me that so many people in our federal society have no realization of the distinction between the powers of the municipal, provincial and federal governments. How can anybody vote intelligently if they do not know who is responsible for what? It is not very useful to go across this country speaking about