

Speech from the Throne

significantly. The third product that is important in my constituency is hogs. We all recognize that hog prices were very low in recent months, and it is for that reason the federal government has just announced a \$5 per hog special subsidy for up to 200 hogs. This will mean that many of my hog producers will receive outright cash assistance from the federal treasury totalling \$1,000. It is a once only subsidy because many hog producers were anxious that we should not create a policy which would result in many people rushing into the industry, thereby further deflating hog prices. The government has taken action to improve the situation. To the average hog producer it has been very welcome and needed action.

Egg prices, like hog prices, have been unusually low but the future looks brighter for egg producers. One reason is that this House has passed Bill C-176. These are vitally important actions, especially the passage of Bill C-176, for such producers as egg producers and the federal assistance should be a real boon to hog producers who have been having a difficult time.

As I mentioned at the outset, I wish to turn to yet another topic. The people I represent have strong feelings about strikes and labour unrest. I would be less than responsible in representing them if I did not take advantage of the Throne Speech debate to point that out. At the moment, I am receiving some very intense pressure from all the different and conflicting sides of labour struggles, such as the present electronic technicians' strike. On the one hand, I hear from people who believe very firmly that the government should settle at once, meet the demands and settle. Others believe very firmly that we should outlaw strikes, while a third group insists that we should hold the payline and not set off another spiral of inflation such as that triggered by the seaway settlement of a few years ago. Like other members, I get it from all sides.

It seems to me that in this day and age we have to move away from the old style labour relations, namely confrontation. I am sure every Canadian has very real sympathy with what is happening in the United Kingdom where the Conservative government of Prime Minister Heath has seen the nation literally brought to its knees and faced with national bankruptcy while the people suffer incredible hardships because of the very difficult labour situation in the coal strike. We in Canada must work hard and do all we can to prevent a similar situation from ever occurring here. The truth is that the public suffers no matter in what area the strike is. I regret that I do not have any smart answers or simple solutions, because I do not think there are any. We need to rethink our labour relations so that we do not get into the position of having industry and the public at large chronically handicapped from strikes or slowdowns. We must move to stop this sort of action.

It is interesting to note that the United States, which has just settled a long standing strike on the west coast, estimates that the nation lost \$23 million a day during that time. A strike of that proportion is a luxury that we cannot afford nor, I hasten to add, can we afford to diminish the right of workers to bargain collectively. This front and how to improve it is one of the real challenges of this decade which we must meet ere the 1980s are upon us.

Soon after the last election this government introduced the Official Languages Act. The prime purpose of that act

was to give official status in the government of Canada and the agencies of the government, to English and to French. The basic assumption of the Official Languages Act was that most Canadians would never speak more than one language, so in order to enable Canadians who spoke only one language to deal with their government the government gave them the legal right to use either language. While that act was before this House, Mr. Speaker, every one of the four political parties supported it and suggested that this was a just and fair move. Every political party and every political party leader voted for the bill and supports it to this day. The Liberals supported it, the Progressive Conservatives supported it, the New Democratic Party supported it and the Ralliement Cr ditiste supported it. No political party opposed it. The House rarely shows such unanimity and agreement.

On Friday morning last the Leader of the Progressive Conservative party, who is also the Leader of the Official Opposition, (Mr. Stanfield) gave his party's official rebuttal to the government's program when he participated in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. It would seem to me that that was the time when any flaw in the government's approach would have been pounced upon and, politics being the art of discrediting those in power, we might have expected any and every difficulty in our society to be attributed directly to the government's desire to destroy and diminish. It is traditional in the parliamentary process that the failure to meet any human need not yet fully met be made to appear a direct result of government callousness, any injustice turned to appear as though the government loved evil and hated good. That is the game; we all understand the rules. In parliamentary democracy we believe that good will does come by such exaggeration; that democracy is best served by the people being suspicious of every and all governments. It also means that if there is a real issue, or what might even appear to be an issue of real injustice being perpetrated, then it would be a very inept and bungling opposition that failed to trumpet it from the rooftops.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was with great care that I listened to the Conservative party leader's speech on Friday I even reread his remarks carefully in *Hansard*. What I expected to find and what I heard was there only in part. I emphasize, it was there only in part. The government was condemned by the official opposition because it is still negotiating with the United States on items on which there is still some outstanding difference. Secondly, the government was condemned because, as the Prime Minister has reminded us, there is a need for more job creation and because a number of our citizens are unemployed. We were told that even though more than 200,000 new jobs were created in 1971, that was not good enough. There must be more yet. We were, of course, reminded by the Prime Minister that this item has been given a very high priority.

• (1510)

The Leader of the Opposition attacked the government on several issues, some real and some imagined. However, to my utter amazement, one issue was not mentioned at all. There was no reference to the Official Languages Act, or to the government's implementation of that act, which every party supported when it was before the House. That