

*The Address—Mr. Dinsdale*

grave emergencies such as total war when all national resources have been marshalled for survival, government should not interfere in the affairs of business so long as it is operating legally and performing a public service.

The minister of external affairs also, speaking last March at the 25th anniversary of Yorkminster church in Toronto, had this to say, according to a press dispatch:

... 'the combination of reliance on the all-powerful state and a passion for material progress may become as great a menace to our future as Russia's 175 divisions.'

He spoke out against the tendency to 'become more and more accustomed to lean on' the government and called on the churches to emphasize the moral worth and value of the individual as a counter-balance.

And of course we have that classical expression from the dean of the Liberal party, the hon. member for Quebec South, which, I imagine, has been quoted many times, when he referred to the office-holding mania of the party now in power in this house. He said that the traditional party for progress and reform had gone right off the track and was travelling in the ditch of expediency and improvisation. What it required was a re-birth and resurgence of liberalism and a clear re-statement of its principles.

That was said in 1947. This situation has not developed overnight. It is one that has been developing slowly since the thirties in this country.

These statements, particularly the statement by the Prime Minister and the minister of external affairs, would tend to suggest that the Liberal party is trying to become conservative by evolution rather than by election, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this cannot be done. In this case the leopard cannot change its spots. Only a change in administration can accomplish the desired end. It is possible to move forward towards what has been described in this chamber as socialism, or nationalism or state socialism; but a political party cannot juggle indefinitely in the middle of the political highway in order to catch the prevailing tide of public opinion. I suggest that only a change in administration can bring this very necessary state of affairs to pass in this country. I would re-echo the words of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, when he said it was high time that this country returned to a strong two-party system because it was the only basis upon which our British parliamentary institutions can operate successfully.

Speaking directly now to the resolution by the leader of this party, I feel that he highlights this situation when he says, as appears at page 43 of *Hansard* dated November 16, 1953:

We respectfully represent to Your Excellency that the welfare of Canada is dependent upon free competition; and that the prosperity and security of all Canadians will be advanced by government policies which will restore markets for primary products and generally promote a high volume of international trade.

I know that will be misunderstood in certain quarters as depreciating the new emphasis upon social responsibility in our twentieth century world, but I think that it does highlight one of the major problems and indicates a retreat from statism. I think most hon. members in this house will agree with me that governments can become too big, too powerful and too successful for their own good as well as for the good of the country. After all, big government is much more dangerous to freedom than so-called big business or big labour, for that matter.

I do not know whether I should give another quotation at this time. The hon. member for Eglinton hit this point yesterday, though I do not know if he hit it heavily enough, when he mentioned a particular emphasis in a particular constituency for the sake of political advantage. This came over my local radio station during the campaign on July 28, 1953:

Have you thought of what it has cost the Brandon-Souris constituency to have an opposition member in Ottawa?

Well, in terms of indemnity it does not cost very much, as I am discovering. Going back to the quote:

The businessmen of Brandon, Souris, Virden, Killarney, Boissevain, Deloraine and Melita and other towns have felt the costs. When a Liberal represented Brandon, our skilled workmen found ready employment in government projects throughout this constituency.

We have seen Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie benefit by government projects. These cities had spokesmen in Ottawa on the government side of the house. Brandon-Souris languished because we had an opposition member.

Then, skipping part of this, I continue:

Consider the high cost of opposition representation at Ottawa, when you mark your ballot on August 10. If we are to share in large government projects, we must send a government member to Ottawa.

That actually came over the air, and it highlights most forcefully the state of affairs with which I have been trying to deal briefly this afternoon. Man in spite of himself becomes impressed with his own importance. If we carried the implication of that statement to its logical conclusion it would of course mean a one-party state, with no one other than a government member elected. And I am sure no member even on the government side of the house wishes to have that.

Turning again to the amendment of the Progressive Conservative party, I believe there