

The Address—Mr. Dinsdale

during the summer holidays in this mechanized, industrialized era. I think, therefore, that we should avoid a repetition of what took place—a repetition of this midsummer madness—even though it means the possibility of a threat to this overwhelming majority that we will have to put up with in this house for the next few years. I am glad to see that the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) has placed a resolution on the order paper that makes some concrete suggestions about this particular problem.

I am sure that if the election had come this fall, for example, when the people of Canada had awakened to their responsibilities, and when the new economic situations had taken shape, the result would have been much different and we would have had a much healthier political state of affairs in the country.

I deal with this subject because I feel that something is happening to our parliamentary system. We in the House of Commons are actually too close to the situation to see it happening; we cannot see the woods for the trees. But there are many authorities in the field who are wringing their hands and are wondering what is to become of parliamentary democracy. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Regier) made some reference to it in his remarks, and I was quite interested in what he said. A recent book published under the title of "The Passing of Parliament"—I have forgotten the name of the author—deals with this sobering problem and the fate of our parliamentary system. Recently at the University of Toronto, Lady Violet Carter, who was delivering the Sir Robert Falconer lectures, among many remarks said something to the effect that parliamentary government is being replaced by party government. I feel that this statement applies particularly to Canada at the present time where we have had one party in power continuously for 18 years, with only a brief break in between; and by the time the record of this twenty-second parliament is completed, it will have completed 22 years. Our Canadian political situation has become confused by an excess of compromise and political expediency.

I recall that yesterday the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) got on to this point briefly. He was trying to discover whether the present majority party in the house was socialistic or whether it was Liberal, and no one could quite come to a conclusion as to its proper designation because it has been watered down by long years of compromise and political expediency. This has serious

implications, I feel, for public affairs and for our parliamentary system in Canada.

Canada has a special difficulty confronting it as a federal state. We have always been faced with the problem of maintaining federal unity in the face of diversity. This problem always comes up during elections. Some say the Conservative party contributes to disunity and maintain that the Liberal party contributes to unity. Of course, that is the opinion of Liberal spokesmen. During my campaign I had several episodes of this kind that disturbed me because I do not think it is in the best interests of confederation in this country. We had an advertisement that appeared in all my weekly papers as follows:

Manitoba now receives \$23 million yearly under the dominion tax agreement. Drew would scrap this to fatten the money bags of Ontario and Quebec. Dare we take a chance? . . . Vote Liberal.

That is the old technique of dividing one section against another and actually it is as dead as the dodo because very few of us in the west now look upon either Ontario or Quebec as the big bad wolf, as the westerners used to do back in the 1920's or perhaps back in the period 1910 to 1920; but it still keeps coming up, and in some sections of our western provinces it has serious effects during an election. It is that sort of thing that has resulted partly in the unfortunate splintering on the prairies, where we have each one of our prairie provinces split among the four political parties in this country.

I again was interested in the phrase and the words that were used by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam when he referred to the necessity of consolidation in this country politically. I think that is one of the urgent necessities if we are going to continue to realize the great potential of Canada in the modern world and if we are going to move towards increasing national unity rather than be divided up as we have been, particularly since the depression.

It is unfortunate that there is a tendency for political parties to get hived up in certain sections. We are reaching a stage in Canada where we have a different political party for almost each province. I think it is especially unfortunate that the majority party in this house has 111 of its seats from the two central provinces. The Liberal party has not been getting a very good reception out west in recent years, and the reasons for that are all too obvious. That might be the reason for the disappearance of the red ties among the Liberal ranks. You were not in the house, Mr. Speaker, when that phrase was used, but most of what they used to call "the ginger group" among the Liberals came from