

The Address—Mr. Hurlburt

my riding and in the province of Quebec when I have sold cattle there. These people do not understand why bilingualism seems to be all right for the rest of Canada but not for Quebec. They condemn the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for not checking the constitutional legality of Bill-22. I drove to Magog Lake and Sawyerville, Quebec. I was lost three times. There was not an English sign on the highway.

If one came to my constituency he would see that we have bilingual signs. There are bilingual signs in Waterton Lakes national park. One area of concern is that although there were beautiful signs all through the park which blended in with the scenery, they were taken down. These signs had English on top and French on the bottom. They were taken down and new signs were put up. These signs are painted green, with white lettering. The English is on the left and the French on the right, because it was considered discriminatory to have the French under the English. This is costing the Canadian taxpayer thousands and thousands of dollars, and I think it should stop.

● (1720)

The only thing we should be looking for in our country is total integration, and I think that is what we are after. In 1905, people from the province of Quebec settled in our country, and so did the people from Ontario. I think we must stop this government and this Prime Minister adopting the attitude of "divide and conquer". This is splitting us up and I think we are all agreed that we do not want to split; we all want one Canada. Out west we are sure of one thing, namely, that this government can legislate to its heart's content but eventually Canada will develop its own North American culture.

The next issue of concern to the people in my constituency is the breakdown in our relations with the United States. I should like it to be known that I am definitely not anti-American; I am pro-Canadian. I think that we should be thankful that our neighbour is the United States and that we do not border Red China or Russia. I suggest that we come to our senses and realize who our largest trading partner is. I have seen the day when we really needed them so far as our livestock industry was concerned. We are now looking for reciprocal agreements. We feel that it is our duty to get along with our neighbour, whether it be across a barbed-wire fence or across a border, and we firmly believe that if the present trend continues—particularly if the socialist party here continues to keep the universities riled up, to keep a heavy concentration of union workers riled up, and to divert our attention to the United States and keep them riled up—there will be only one loser, and it will be us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hurlburt: Next I would like to make some comments about the biggest concern in Canada. We are all concerned about agriculture. We think we have problems with bilingualism and with the continued breakdown in our relations with the United States. But I say that the most serious problem we have today is the ever increasing trend toward socialism. Men and women in the public spotlight are constantly being asked to express their opinions on the thousands of governmental proposals and

[Mr. Hurlburt.]

projects. They are asked such questions as: what do you think of DREE; what is your opinion of LIP or OFY; how do you feel about urban renewal? The list is endless. All too often answers to these questions seem to be based, not on any solid principle but upon the popularity of the specific government program in question. Seldom are men willing to oppose a popular program if they themselves wish to be popular, especially if they seek public office. Unlike the political opportunist, the true statesman values principle above popularity and works to create popularity for those political principles which are wise and just.

I should like to outline in clear, concise and straightforward terms the political principles to which I subscribe. These are the guidelines which determine now and in the future my attitudes and actions toward all proposals and projects of the government. These are the principles which, in my opinion, proclaim the proper role of government in the affairs of the nation. I believe that governments are instituted by man for the benefit of man, and that we hold men accountable for their acts in relation to them, both in making laws and administering them for the good and safety of society.

I believe that no government can exist in peace unless such laws are so framed, and not violated, as to secure for each individual the free exercise of conscience, the right to and control over property, and the protection of life. The proper role of government includes such defensive activities as the maintenance of national military and local police forces for protection against loss of life, loss of property and loss of freedom at the hands of either foreign forces or domestic criminals. The way to have a good and safe government is not to trust all to one, but to divide it among the many, distributing to everyone the functions which he is competent to exercise.

History has proven that each class or special interest group competes with the others to use the lever of governmental power in their favour, or at least to immunize themselves against the effects of a previous thrust. Labour receives a minimum wage, so agriculture seeks a price support. Consumers demand price controls, and industry receives protective tariffs. In the end, no one is much further ahead and everyone suffers the burdens of a gigantic bureaucracy and loss of personal freedom. With each group being out to get its share of the spoils, the result is that historically governments have mushroomed into total welfare states. Once the process begins, once the principle of the protective function of government gives way to the aggressive or redistributive function, forces are set in motion that drive the nation toward totalitarianism. It is impossible to introduce into society a greater evil than the conversion of the law into an instrument of plunder.

Students of history know that no government in the history of mankind has ever created any wealth. It is the people who work who create wealth. According to the Marxist doctrine, a human being is primarily an economic creature. In other words, his material well-being is all-important and his privacy and his freedom are strictly secondary. The Soviet constitution reflects this philosophy in its emphasis on security, food, clothing, housing, medical care—the same things that might be considered in jail. The basic concept is that the government has full respon-