

and controlled by their governments. However, though the physical subjection of people is rare, we see today the struggles and tensions developing over control, not of man's body but his mind. This struggle is being waged with ever greater and more subtle intensity. I say this because every day we hear the expressions "brainwashing", "subconscious persuasion" or "imagine making". These are the tools of the ad men who use them to sell us new products, new ideas or tired, frustrated, old politicians.

Now, salesmanship is not new, for down through the years we have had traders and conmen. But what is new is that today we are in an electronic age where there are tremendous opportunities for manipulation of the media. In my opinion, the present situation puts a tremendous responsibility on what is still called the free democratic press of this country. We said during the campaign as Conservatives that in the event we formed the government we would abolish Information Canada and this wasteful extravagance. Quite frankly it is bad enough at times to receive inadequate news coverage, but in my opinion there is a far greater danger, and that is manipulated news by the government in power. Government diluted and directed information in this electronic age could so assail freedom of thought and opinion as to fatally undermine what is left of our free institutions.

I believe the salvation of our country and the solution to our problems lies where it always has, in the strength of the individual mind and character. It is the message which is the thing of value and, in my opinion, the men in the press gallery have a tremendous responsibility in this session to see that the message of the twenty-ninth parliament is clearly conveyed and portrayed to the Canadian people. That is the point I want to stress most clearly at this time.

In the time allotted to me it is not possible to deal with all the proposals put forth in the throne speech. In the wording of the speech, the government is fully committed to two prominent goals, namely national unity and equality of opportunity for all Canadians. These are high sounding ideals, and in my area of Canada one of the items contributing to disunity in this country and inequality of opportunity is the transportation policies of the federal government, and our problems in this area have intensified in recent years. We have had nine freight increases in two years.

Studies of this problem have been made, solutions have been proposed and, almost without exception, these have been deferred, watered down, shelved or ignored. As a result our agricultural industry, our fishing industry and all forms of our manufacturing industries operate at a tremendous disadvantage when compared to industries located in other parts of Canada. Unfortunately, recent policy statements by this government will only serve to compound our problems. Here I refer to the announcement to build four new icebreakers to break the ice on the St. Lawrence seaway in order to extend the shipping season on the Great Lakes. Obviously, this government is oblivious to the changes which have been brought about in the shipping industry, and apparently it plans to write off the total capital cost with interest amounting to some \$700 million on the St. Lawrence seaway. I say this

The Address—Mr. Crouse

because the seaway cannot pay its way, and its operation to date has not justified its tremendous cost to the people of Canada. At the present time the trend toward larger ocean going ships, the establishment of seaside container shipping facilities and the introduction of rail developments that shorten the running time from ocean ports to inland centres, plus the shallow depth of the seaway, make the waterway obsolete even in the summertime. I suppose by raising this criticism it will be pointed out to me that I am anti-Quebec. This effects not only Quebec but Ontario as well. What I am saying is that we should not pursue and continue the waste of money on this obsolete facility.

Today the maritime provinces, especially Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, have the only natural deep-water ports north of Norfolk, Virginia. With 500,000 deadweight ton tankers now on the drawingboards, the shipping industry seems almost certain to come back into its own in Atlantic Canada. In my opinion, it would make sense to retain the seaway as a seasonal water route for the inland coastal trade and grain movements, while using our tax dollars to upgrade facilities in Nova Scotia which can be used on a year round basis, and are closer to overseas trading centres. I believe quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that any dollars spent on expanding year round shipping on the seaway are dollars robbed from Atlantic Canada. I say this because we are told all our transportation services in Atlantic Canada must be kept on a paying basis. I ask this government, why are we in Atlantic Canada singled out? Why does this rule of thumb not apply to other parts of Canada?

Our natural business axis in Atlantic Canada is north and south, not east and west, but our natural growth has been hampered by unfair and unjust freight rate charges and by tariff changes which favoured central Canadian manufacturers to the detriment of industrialists in Atlantic Canada. Some 100 million inhabitants of the eastern United States seaboard are within easy shipping access from ports in Nova Scotia. These markets present new and even greater opportunities for our fishing industry, and there is a great potential in this area for expanding our agricultural economy through the increased sale of our agricultural products, especially quality pork products. Nova Scotian farmers have a good base of breeding stock, they have vast experience in management and in feeding, and producers have proven that they can compete in quality pork products with anyone on this continent.

In my opinion, this industry could be expanded, but our agricultural industry, our Christmas tree shippers, our fishing industry and our industrialists are penalized and held back by an antiquated transportation policy. We need a change in present policy, and in my opinion the emphasis must be shifted from railway profits to development of the Atlantic region.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock?

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.