

minister is so inflexible that he is not going to bend his knees and say "I listened to the wrong people". Why does he not say that to the farmers, so that he can say, "You have heard the truth from my own lips?" If I were caught beside a cherry tree which had been chopped down and I had an axe in my hand and my old man asked me what happened, I would tell the truth. That is what the government must learn to do.

● (1430)

I did not enter this debate in order to teach modern methods of thinking to the Minister of Justice. That would be impossible. I entered it, in part, because I want to pay my respects to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I say to those hon. members that I recognize the honour the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has paid them in allowing them to move and second this important and traditional motion. Speaking as an older person and member, I always look at those speeches to see if any new contribution has been made by those bright members. I think the congratulations extended by hon. members to those two speakers are well founded.

I think we should be aware, in this debate, of speeches made in the House which are different from the ordinary, that is to say, unusual. Such a speech was made one week ago by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche): I do not know how many members have read his speech or how many listened to him in the House. His speech was unusual. He bared his soul and thoughts as he dealt with the sickness that is evident in the western world today. I commend the hon. member's speech to members of the House and to the country. Not all may agree with his sentiments, but it should be noted that there is at least one member who is groping for the truth and the way ahead.

I, too, want to speak about the malaise gripping ministers who are supporters of governments adhering to the western style of democracy. This malaise can be seen in Japan, France, Italy, Israel, the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada. The malaise is a common denominator in those countries. People in them are looking at their leaders and asking what is wrong. They say, "Our leaders do not seem to know what they are talking about and, despite all the pronouncements made by the use of public relations experts, what they say still does not ring true." What governments say has little bearing on the deep worries of individuals. So, my criticisms of this government today are aimed not merely at this government. They are aimed at the ministerial malaise which grips western style democracies.

I do not know if I am right. This I do know: ever since the war, ever since the great penetration by governments into the affairs of private individuals, we have developed, all of us, a charming, amiable, dedicated but determined bureaucracy which, more and more, has run the countries of the western world and which has left to members of parliament and to cabinets the task of making their announcements *ex cathedra*.

This process is of concern to me, a member of parliament in a western style democracy. On several occasions in this House, in 1966 and 1967, and again last September 13, I

*The Address—Hon. A. Hamilton*

spoke about two or three problems in this area and about ways of solving those problems. Let me begin by referring to an article written in the magazine *Executive* by one of the older and more experienced members of the news gallery, Douglas Fisher, who, in more than one way, is one of the more substantial members of the gallery. I think most members know that Douglas Fisher at one time used to sit in this House in opposition as a member of the NDP. I shall refer to his views about the role of ministers of the Crown in the present government, and to that of deputy ministers.

Apparently, it was the dream of the socialist from the Montreal milieu to set up a substructure when he was in power, and to employ experts in that substructure. He wanted to leave all decision making to the bureaucrats within the substructure, so that politicians would only need to take their advice, run the country accordingly and all would be well. Apparently this structure did not work too well. It has fallen apart. Actually, the election of 1972 ended its role, and now we have a government that is no longer run by the bureaucracy or a government in which one bureaucracy watches another; according to Douglas Fisher, we have a government in which ministers of the Crown are flying by the seats of their pants. I welcome that. I would rather see a minister with common sense speaking for the people he represents and making decisions on the basis of the facts before him than the horrendous system of bureaucracy, of committee on committee, trying for years and years to arrive at a consensus.

In this modern day when conditions are changing so rapidly and becoming so complex, the middle ages approach to running government is obsolete, and has been for some time. So, I welcome that article by Douglas Fisher. I commend it to members on the government side as well as to members on my side, who some day soon hope to make up the government party. We are living in important times and we shall need to make individual and important decisions to overcome problems.

I wish to add to my remarks of September 13. There are three areas of concern in the economic field. They are of concern to all thinking politicians in the world, regardless of the form of government they support. What are these concerns? First, economic advisers of governments, of both the so-called free enterprise countries and of the socialist countries, have no model, no framework for decisions dealing with a new phenomenon that has developed noticeably since the war, the phenomenon called cost-push. That is something which concerns ministers of socialist governments as well as those of free enterprise countries. I will return to that subject.

Second, all governments, regardless of their political outlook, are worried about the threat posed by huge capital accumulations or concentrations which endanger the precarious monetary and fiscal systems we have evolved for running the world. I am referring, of course, to the \$120 billion odd in Eurodollars. It does not matter how these Eurodollars were accumulated. They are now a threat to world economic stability. In addition, of course, there is a great concentration of money in the hands of oil producing countries, many of them Arab countries. This concentration of capital which has no easy access to investment has brought the world into the position where it has never