

(Mr. Simmons). I have always had some sadness that I was a Cabinet Minister for only nine months. I truly hoped that it would have been a lot longer than that. But ten days is absolutely ridiculous.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Where did he go anyway? Roger left.

**Mr. Huntington:** The issue in the motion today, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious one. It cuts right to the heart of political debate in Canada. This country is controlled by that political ideology and those people who believe that interventionism is the right way to rule the people. On the other hand, I come from a Party which has a tendency to believe that behaviourism is the right way. If you define your laws and the sense of behaviour properly, and allow people to work in widely different activities within those laws and patterns of behaviour, then you will bring out the magic of the human powers of innovation and development, the incentives which encourage people to work and create wealth, and you will not have the dilemma we are facing in this country today.

The motion is a very serious one, Sir. As I was wandering through the Lambert Royal Commission Report on Financial Management and Control, I was reminded of an excerpt from a speech by Prime Minister James Callaghan to a Labour Party conference on September 28, 1976. I would like to read that into the record because I think it goes right to the heart of the reason for the wording of this motion today. It says:

When we reject unemployment, as we all do . . . then we must ask ourselves unflinchingly—what is the cause of high unemployment? Quite simply and unequivocally it is caused by paying ourselves more than the value of what we produce . . . It is an absolute fact of life which no government, be it left or right, can alter . . . We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boosting government spending. I tell you in all candour that that option no longer exists and that insofar as it ever did exist, it worked by injecting inflation into the economy. And each time that happened the average level of unemployment has risen . . . And each time we did this the twin evils of unemployment and inflation have hit hardest those least able to stand them—our own people, the poor, the old and the sick.

What we are dealing with here is that even leaders of opposing ideology share the view that modern day parliamentary democracies so far have been unable to bring their spendthrift and wasteful habits under control, each apparently aware that not to do so will aggravate the economic and social tragedy facing us. That is the political dilemma we are in. It does not matter whether you are of the interventionist ideology or the behaviourist ideology, here is a British Prime Minister addressing the Labour Conference in Britain in 1976 and laying out the dilemma. It is a Catch-22 situation. We stand in this House and yell and shout at each other, a perfect example of which was the performance of the previous speaker, the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's, who fancies himself an absolute and perfect politician; that is what politics is all about. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am not here for that type of behaviour, that type of debate or that type of comment. I have learned a little bit about history, and the other day I saw an article in Richard J. Needham's "A

### Supply

Writer's Notebook" which I thought was very applicable to the dilemma we are in today. He points out that:

In countries like Malaysia and Sri Lanka, the industrial revolution is just beginning; but in Britain, where it originated some 150 years ago, the industrial revolution is drawing to its end.

Then he points out some very interesting data from a *Washington Post* editorial:

In the past 10 years employment in British manufacturing has dropped 30 per cent. British steel production, declining steadily, is now about half of the 1973 level. Automobile production is about half of the 1973 level. Ten years ago just over one-fourth of the cars sold in Britain we imported; currently well over half of them are.

Does it sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? We are always just a little bit behind the British Fabian socialist movement, but we have imported the mistakes they made which they are now trying to correct. It goes on:

Increasingly, Britain buys its manufactured goods from other countries.

That is the dilemma the mother country of the industrial revolution faces today. So where do they go? What are they going to do? There are some 55 million in that country and some three million are now unemployed. It is pointed out that there is nothing to prevent that figure from going to four, five or six million. This raises the question that was asked some weeks ago in Newark, New Jersey:

—what do you do, what can you do, with a huge surplus population unwilling or unable to support itself?

He points out that that was the problem that destroyed Rome. What we are dealing with is an element of human nature which seems to just cycle in and out of societies as time goes along. I think we are at a point where we had better wake up. We had better get our anticipation levels down. We had better understand the reason for this Opposition motion today put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). We had better get rid of the political rhetoric and address the Catch-22 situation that we are in to see if we cannot put the nation on an emergency basis of some kind and start to become competitive in the world once again. It points out too in this article of Needham that Ben Franklin said in 1789:

● (1700)

Though we may set out in the beginning with moderate salaries (for politicians) we shall find that such will not be of long continuance. Reasons will never be wanting for proposed augmentations, and there will always be a party for giving more to the rulers, that the rulers may be able in return to give more to them. Hence, as all history informs us, there has been in every state and kingdom a constant kind of warfare between the governing and the governed: the one striving to obtain more for its support, and the other to pay less. And this has alone occasioned great convulsions, actual civil wars, ending either in dethroning of the princes or enslaving of the people. Generally, indeed, the ruling power carries its point, and we see the revenues of princes constantly increasing, and we see that they are never satisfied, but always in want of more. The more the people are discontented with the oppression of taxes, the greater need the prince has of money to distribute among his partisans, and pay the troops that are to suppress all resistance and enable him to plunder at pleasure. There is scarce a king in a hundred who would not, if he could follow the example of Pharaoh—get first of all the people's money, then all their lands, and then make them and their children servants forever.

These words apply today, Mr. Speaker. We have just heard the Member for Burin-St. George's talk about the National