

Prime Minister's Speech

Introduction of debate

Explanation of background or need for resolution

Statement of Resolution

Definitions

Do you agree that these are the important terms

Should a source be given for these definitions

Is this too vague?

Summary or paraphrase of resolution as defined

Statement of issues

Statement of advantages of government plan

"Headline" summary of the case

Is this logical? Wouldn't it be sufficient if a representative cross section took part?

As I note later, this is a forced justification—the resolution would seem to call for a military rationale; it is given an

1 Million Canadians are out of work. Canadians in all parts of the country resent the "special privileges" which they think are given to other regions of Canada. International peace making—once Canada's most important contribution to foreign policy—is no longer a job we fulfill. Some Canadians have not travelled and are unprepared for hard work when they start their first job.

The government therefore proposes that, "All Canadians between the ages of 18—25 be required to do two years mandatory military service."

The important terms in this debate are the words, "All", "mandatory" and "military service".

By, "all Canadians" we mean all Canadians who are physically well—those suffering from a disability will be exempted;

By, "Mandatory" we mean that the service would be compulsory but the individual could choose when during that seven year period he had to begin his military service;

By, "Military service" we are obviously not thinking of front line fighting. Canada is not at war with any country and we are not going to declare war to achieve our purpose. We mean, "service in the Armed Forces"—which will include everything from full peace keeping duties for those who wish, to civil defence and local improvement projects for others. The service would begin with a period of basic training for everyone.

What we are discussing, then, is whether "All able bodied Canadians between the ages of 18 and 25 should be required to do 2 years service in the Armed Forces."

The key issues in this debate are:

a) Why the service should be mandatory; b) Why the service should be military.

Why should we adopt this proposal? The government presents five reasons:

1) Reduce unemployment; 2) Increase Canadian Unity; 3) Improve our role as a Peace maker; 4) Provide travel opportunities for young Canadians; 5) Train Canadians for hard work.

These reasons might be summarized as "Employment, Unity, Peace, Travel and Training."

We believe that the programme should be mandatory to ensure the goal of Canadian unity—all should participate so that Canadians from every background and region will come to know Canadians from every other background and region. Unity will not be advanced if some took part and some did not. We think, however, that all will want to be part of this exciting opportunity.

We believe that the programme should be military to provide employment without displacing those who are already working—we could require everyone to build houses for two years, but that would put carpenters out of work.

economic one with this justification for its military tone

I will now talk about of Employment, while my colleague will speak about the other four advantages of the government programme.

Are there 1½ people between 18-25?

1 million Canadians are out of work. If we could put all those between 18-25 to work for two years, Canada would have near full employment. More over, when the young people did enter the job market, they would be better prepared by their discipline and training to work a normal working day. There is no better way to employ them.

This is really the 5th advantage, snuck in here

For this reason, and for the other reasons I have outlined which my colleague will present, the government believes that all Canadians between 18—25 should do 2 years mandatory military service. It promises Employment, Unity, Peace, Travel and Training at a time when these qualities are sorely needed

A suitable conclusion, but not a strong one

General notes

The strategy of the government in this debate has been to take a resolution, which would seem to have a military justification, and focus the debate instead on the economic reasons for passing the resolution (ie, reducing unemployment). This is an effective strategy, if it catches the opposition off guard as a result, and if the case as presented can hang together with this change of emphasis. We will have a chance later in the debate to decide whether the justifications for the military nature of the service are made out; the opposition in effect can say, "All right, let's hire 1½ million people, (at the same cost the government proposes) but let's not have it be military service.

As a general criticism of the Government case as presented by the Prime Minister, I note there are few plan details, and few facts in support. For instance, what transition provisions would we make for the first few year the plan is in effect: do we say that those already 18=25 would be exempt from the plan, or that they all must participate in the first year of its operation (emptying our universities for two years). The speech would also benefit from more fact and less theory: sure, a lot of people are out of work. But this is not such a revolutionary idea that no one has thought about it before. There should be some examination of the advantages and disadvantages that others have identified.

Think now about what the Opposition response should be. Should the Opposition (which has probably prepared for a debate with a military justification) try to return the debate to that, by a vigorous attack on definitions, or should they accept the Economic justification and attack the debate as it is?

This is an important, and difficult decision: if the Opposition attacks the definitions, the debate will not fit together well as a whole— one side will talk economics and the other world peace. The debate is almost certain to be won or lost simply on the question of definitions—there is no other clash between the teams. In this case, where the Government has come up with an unusual rationale for the plan (rather than an unusual definition) I think the Opposition must accept the economic justification and try to win the debate on that basis. This decision having been made, what facts (or absence of facts) and what arguments should the Opposition attack?

1st Opposition Speech

Statement of the Opposition position—there is a fundamental fault in the government case.

Accepts the definition, but points out it was intended to unfairly favour the government.

(In common with most unusual approaches to a resolution, this one has major flaws.)

Is this a strong enough attack on cost, and the lack of thought which has been given to plan details?

Because the government approach was unexpected, the opposition reply is a little vague—short on detail. Should the opposition have presented this as a “formal” counter-plan, or should it just have noted this shortcoming as it does?

Another important shortcoming of the government plan.

Were these the correct points to attack? Was the use of the concrete, “Mary” example the best way to make the attack.

Good summary but a soft conclusion.

General notes

This is a fairly sound attack given that it is all “impromptu”—improvised in response to an unexpected government case.

Mr Speaker, we on the Opposition benches agree that the Canadian economy is in bad shape. Many people are out of work. But we don't believe a temporary solution is the answer. The real solution is to train people for useful permanent work.

I was surprised when my friend defined “military service” to include such nonmilitary service as “local improvement projects”—I can picture the Canadian Army painting the St. Fintan's Post Office—but I am not here to quibble about definitions. The case my friend has presented falls to the ground of its own weight even as he has defined it.

He pretended that the two issues were “mandatory” service and “military” service. The issues are really “Costs” and “results”. His proposal is expensive at a time when Canada is poor, and would have no lasting results.

Let us imagine what the Prime Minister proposes. Imagine Mary McInnes, who has just turned 18. Well, she goes off in this programme. Now up til now she's been in school and lived at home with her Mom and Dad. But now she has to be fed, and clothed, and housed by the government of Canada. And someone has to pay for her travel to boot camp. And if she is going to meet other Canadians from “every region of Canada” —that's a lot of travelling. If she is going to travel and see the world, it means more cost. And what does the country get out of it?—Someone who got a suntan working for the Canadian government. And a bill for two year's pay, two year's training, two year's travel, two year's food, two year's housing. And someone who, after all of that, still does not have the skills to do any job other than work for the government.

Instead of this Grand Plan, it would be better to allow those between 18-25 to be able to receive training at home, or close to home, for those jobs they need. Canada presently has a shortage of people to do certain jobs—we have to bring people in from outside—which is tragic when there are so many Canadians out of work. So the Opposition thinks it would be better to keep people at home where they have food, and housing within the community, and where we don't need massive government expenditures as the world's largest travel agency.

And why make the programme mandatory? If a man wants to stay home and fish with his father, or go on to university and become a doctor, well, why isn't that fine too? I imagine Mary going through Medical school and then being told by this government that she will have to spend two years scrubbing decks on Canadian ships.

Mr Speaker, the real issue here is cost. The government offers a programme that after two years of massive expense leaves people no better off than before. The opposition suggests that a programme where no special food, clothing or travel expenses were required where those who don't want to participate don't have to, and where those who take part can be trained for a job that will exist when the programme is over is what is needed.

I think, Mr Speaker, that for these reasons you must reject the government case.

Minister of Employment

Summarizes the debate and the differences between the two cases; re-states the government case in brief.

Rebuttal — Points out that the Opposition case is a little “fuzzy”. But it is wrong to suggest that the Opposition has to prove anything — the government bears the burden of proof. Even if there are weaknesses in the Opposition, that does not prove the Government case.

Note the absence of a concrete plan or concrete details of cost.

Source? There is no proof of any of this; although likely to lead to unity, it might simply antagonize people.

Fluffy—why will more training a) help NATO or b) help peace keeping?

Cost? How many trips? Where to? How do they travel?

How would military training make people better fishermen?

Summary and soft conclusion.

Mr Speaker, the government and opposition have agreed on the fundamental need to provide Canadians with jobs. What we disagree about is the best way to do it. The government offers a programme that: a) Employs people right away; and also offers hope for b) Unity, c) Peace, d) Travel, and e) Training.

The opposition suggested our programme should be modified so that it does not employ anyone in the short term—when it is really important—and instead offers training for jobs “that may exist in the future”. This sort of thinking is likely to make unskilled unemployed workers into skilled and unemployed workers. To make matters worse, the Opposition assumes that there are 1 million jobs out there waiting for Canadians to be trained to fill them. The government acknowledges that in the long term some new jobs will be filled by retraining, but we also need something in the short term. Besides, even if everyone who is out of work was retrained, there are not 1½ million job vacancies.

The key questions in this debate are, of course, cost and results. The opposition proposes a modest cost and no results; the government plan offers immediate results, short term employment of a million and a half people, and the added advantages of unity, peace, training, and travel. We think that these results are worth what they cost.

Let me now deal with the four remaining government arguments.

Unity—9% of Canadians believe that they would be better off if their region separated from Canada. Students in Newfoundland rarely get to the mainland, let alone meet students from across Canada. If people from western Canada could meet people from Quebec, Toronto, Halifax and Corner Brook, I think they would discover that we’re all pretty much alike. Because of Canada’s size, we have a special need to bring people together. This plan will do it.

Peace—Canada is in a unique position to play a major role in world affairs. It is independent from the U.S. and is well respected by countries in all parts of the world. If it is to continue to make an important contribution, it must have a population which is able to contribute to peace keeping forces. This would also increase our credibility with NATO, because although our permanent army would not increase, we could quickly increase the size of our Armed Forces from these trained volunteers if the need arose.

Travel—This would be an important way for Canadians to see other parts of the world.

Training—Many employers complain that people just out of school aren’t used to hard work. One way to prepare young people for hard work is to let them work hard. It would make these people much more desirable employees.

Mr Speaker, the government has offered a plan that promises Employment, Unity, Peace, Travel and Training. The opposition thought it would be better to do nothing to solve the immediate employment problem and instead produce a lot of skilled unemployed workers. In these circumstances we ask the House to pass this resolution.

Leader of the Opposition

Rebuttal—there is no need at this stage to re-introduce the opposition case

Strong attack on cost. The danger of settling on a single figure (\$8 B) is that the government will try to minimize that figure.

Is cost the issue to attack? I think so—the government has produced no details, and that is clearly a major weakness.

Point conceded, allowing time to focus on the major remaining weakness:

the fact that there are so many opposition arguments available indicates that the government did not think through its case very well.

Again picking up on the failure to tell us what sort of jobs these people would do

Summary and conclusion.

Mr Speaker, the gentleman who just sat down admitted at the beginning of his remarks that the issue in this debate was cost. Well, I cannot think of a more expensive programme than to make everyone in Canada a civil servant for two years after they reach 18. How does my friend plan to pay for this? How much will it cost? My friend says this will employ 1½ million. Well, there are now about 600,000 federal civil servants—if my friend implements his scheme, there will be four times as many—using his figures. Where will the extra money come from?

Even if these people can be fed, housed and clothed, and flown across Canada and across the world for \$100 a week each—the programme will cost more than \$8 Billion dollars a year. That's more than the entire budget of Newfoundland. And that assumes it will cost only \$100 a week.

I defy my friend to show where someone can be housed and fed and clothed for \$100 a week, let alone trained, and flown around the world.

Then my friend wanted to talk about results. I have an admission to make. The opposition suggestion that re-training would make more sense is not a perfect solution to all of Canada's problems. But we don't have the burden of proof. It's not our job to have all of the answers. What we suggested was that at less cost it was possible to put together a programme with some lasting results—not a government make work programme designed to produce the Billion dollar man. If we can afford \$8 Billion—or \$16 Billion or \$24 Billion dollars (the government has yet to tell us what this will cost, or where the money will come from) we can do much better than they suggest. And that's the only point the opposition argument is making.

What else did they tell us? Unity—Well, we agree that spending \$8 Billion dollars will increase unity. We can't afford it. For a Billion dollars we could all be friends.

Peace—This plan will advance peace? Hogwash. Five answers to this: 1) Peace keeping forces don't necessarily increase peace; 2) Having a lot of boy scouts—or civilians who've done military service painting the post office—won't fulfill our commitment to NATO; 3) if the government is proposing to send 18 year olds with six months training to act as peace keeping forces, this is a dangerous plan; 4) We have large enough peace keeping forces already—we get few requests to provide peace keeping troops anyway; 5) Being able to call up trained reserves into the armed forces is irrelevant when a major war, if it comes, will last only an hour.

Training—The government spoke of training. Well, training is important. But the government plan would, at enormous cost, train people for military jobs scrubbing ships. Employers don't need people to scrub ships. At a far more modest cost, we could train people to do worthwhile jobs.

Travel—We can't afford to send people to see the world. They can watch National Geographic reruns on TV if they want to see the world, or pay for it themselves. It's pretty hard to convince a fisherman that he should pay his share of \$8 billion in taxes to send someone else to see the world.

Mr Speaker, the government has ignored the cost of their half-thought out plan. We admit that for \$8 Billion we could increase unity and travel. But the government, even when spending that amount of money, can't manage to train people for worthwhile jobs but only for military service. IF we had \$8 Billion to spare, we could do far better than spend it this way. Mr Speaker, it's government thinking like this that makes Canada mediocre.

Prime Minister (In rebuttal)

Summary of the opposition argument

Answer to the opposition argument. Note that the figure is “finessed”—the lowest figure given by the Opposition is used, and it is divided not by 10 million taxpayers, but by all men, women and children.

Correct statement of his obligation: He does not have to prove all his arguments are correct.

Doesn't this overstate the Opposition position? The attack was not that this plan didn't do everything, but that this claimed advantage did not exist.

Has the issue of travel cost been dealt with? Why not keep people in Canada in their home province?

General notes

Although this is a clever attempt to save the debate, note that we never heard (from the government) what this program would cost or where the money would come from. They would have said nothing about that if the point hadn't been raised by the opposition.

My friend concluded just now by conceding that if we had the money to pay for the government plan, it would work. That's an important if, of course. But I think I can convince you that we have money, and if I do that, I Mr Speaker, that you will be compelled to vote for the government.

\$8 Billion dollars is a lot of money—unless you put it in perspective. That's \$1 a day for the 22 million other people in the country. \$1 a day. Our annual deficit is about \$40 Billion, on an annual budget of more than \$100 Billion. In that context, is a \$1 a day worth it to end unemployment in Canada? We think it is.

Let me return to some of the other opposition arguments. I remind you, Mr Speaker, that even if there were no advantages to this plan except that it ended unemployment, you could still decide that that justified it. So I invite you to agree with the opposition that not all of the other advantages would necessarily follow without problems. But I think you must still side with the government.

Employment—Other than the cost of the plan, the only opposition objection was that we would be training people for useless jobs. As I already said, this is the only job people can do without putting those who are already working out of work.

Unity—The opposition conceded that this would unify the country, and that that was desirable.

Peace—The opposition was correct that this would not guarantee world peace, or solve all of the world's problems. We admit that. But they were wrong to conclude that this would not help peace keeping; we don't plan to send new recruits into peace keeping, but their presence would free up other troops for peace keeping. And they suggested that being able to call up reserves was irrelevant in a modern (nuclear) war. Well, Unemployment is irrelevant if there is a nuclear war, too; everything we've said today is on the assumption that doesn't happen.

Training—The need to do when those jobs will opposition they leave be—this suggested we should train people for existing jobs that they will this programme. Our problem, of course, is that we don't know what programme does the next best thing and gives them general training.

Travel—The opposition agreed that travel would be desirable if it could be afforded. I think I've shown how it can be.

Mr Speaker, this is an expensive plan. Unemployment is a serious problem and we cannot solve it without the massive expenditure of funds. But I have shown where that money will come from. And my friends, at least tacitly, admitted that if I could do that, I would have convinced them. Besides resolving that problem, we may also be able to offer Unity, Peace, Training and Travel. For these reasons, Mr Speaker, I believe that all Canadians should undergo two year's mandatory military service.

Flow Chart of a Demonstration Debate

Prime Minister	1st Opposition	Min. of Employment	Leader of Opposition	Prime Minister (Rebuttal)
<p>1. Mandatory Universal to promote unity</p> <p>2. Military So as not to displace other workers</p> <p>3. Employment a) Necessary b) Would remove 1.5 M from Labour market</p>	<p>1. Inefficient — Dr scrubbing ship</p> <p>2. But training no good for “real” job— see answer to 6.)</p> <p>3. a) Yes b) Too great a cost c) Training at home i) Cheaper ii) Better</p>	<p>b) Worth the cost</p> <p>c) No help: i) Yes, but ii) Few jobs created —may train for wrong job —not enough jobs to be filled</p> <p>4. Unity Would help unify</p> <p>5. Peace a) Needed by NATO b) More peacekeeping c) Larger reserves</p> <p>6. Training Employers want better employees</p> <p>7. Travel Would be good for participants</p>	<p>b) \$8 B! Where from? Public service 4 times its size now</p> <p>4. True, but too expensive</p> <p>5. a) Nonsense — don’t need boy scouts b) No demand for it — Dangerous to use novices c) Irrelevant in nuclear war</p> <p>6. Yes, but this is training for wrong job</p> <p>7. Yes but too expensive</p>	<p>b) \$1 a day is worth it.</p> <p>4. General question of cost answered</p> <p>5. b)—Frees other troops for peacekeeping c) Unemployment is irrelevant if N war; we assume one doesn’t happen</p> <p>6. Alternative displaces those already working — see 2.</p> <p>7. General question of cost answered</p>

The purpose of the flow chart is to make clear the development of the issues, and how particular arguments are answered.

Note that the government did not answer the opposition objections to issues 1, 5 a), 5 b). Similarly, the opposition admits issue 3 a), and did not seriously contest the answer to 3 c)

It is often good strategy for the opposition to focus its attack on a few issues and ignore the others, as is done here. It would be a serious fault for the government not to answer any important opposition challenge, however.