

The Budget—Mr. Balcom

This is particularly true of growing municipalities at this time. Real estate taxes, the backbone of municipal revenue, do not increase as quickly with economic growth as do income or sales taxes. Furthermore, the problem of financing the services demanded has been accentuated in areas where there is a large proportion of tax-exempt property. However, I must acknowledge the fact that this has not led to any reluctance to have federal property in our constituency.

It is a rewarding thing in political life to feel that you know and understand the problems and views of your constituents, and also their needs. For some years an airport was needed to round out one phase of our transportation system. Shortly the Halifax international airport will be an integral part of the transportation facilities in our riding, and we are most gratified at the progress that is being made. The statement by the Minister of Transport that discussions concerning the road to the airport had been held with the premier of Nova Scotia indicates that there are no obstacles to the orderly development of related facilities. However, there are some problems on the Dartmouth side of Halifax harbour which the government should review.

Without going into the matter at length, Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a few specific suggestions. The docking facilities of Dartmouth are inadequate for the fast-growing demands. In particular, the lumber wharf should be replaced by a modern pier, to be part of a great over-all development. The need for a new marine and fisheries building is apparent, and the work of that important department would be greatly facilitated thereby. The Canadian National Railways facilities that service the town and the eastern side of the harbour are inadequate. They look out of date and they are out of date. The trackage and marshalling yards are inadequate and need extensions.

Mr. Speaker, the trend of our manufacturers to ship their products through United States ports is still disturbing to me. It is next to impossible to understand why companies receiving the benefits of high protection should ignore our Canadian ports. How can we expect to develop our ports unless we receive the loyal support of our manufacturers? We in the maritimes pay through the nose for everything that is manufactured in Canada, and by companies receiving tariff concessions.

May I cite a few cases only. First I mention that of the automobile. We in the maritimes have little manufacturing, but we do not squawk too much about the difference in price as between a car purchased in the United States and one bought in Canada nor,

[Mr. Balcom.]

the difference between one bought in Ontario and one bought in Nova Scotia. In this latter instance, on an automobile we buy in the maritimes we pay an added freight charge of about \$100. This is due, of course, to the centralization of industry in Ontario. An automobile should sell for the same price in Halifax as it does in Oshawa or Windsor. The over-all freight charges should be worked out so the charge should be a Canadian-wide average. It is not a greatly involved problem but one which the manufacturers could solve with little difficulty. It is true the population living near the plants would pay more, but this consideration would be offset by the benefits to the population in the fringe areas.

But to come back to the use of our ports, may I say this. We cannot be very happy when we see such a large proportion of our automobiles shipped through United States ports. I believe that one Canadian automobile company has changed its policy and is making greater use of our facilities. The car industry is not the only offender. Machinery, except agriculture, is shipped through foreign ports to the value of millions of dollars, to the extent of nearly 50 per cent of the total exports in this commodity; and of all things, 86.6 per cent of the farm implements travel through United States ports, leaving 13.4 per cent, the crumbs, to be divided among Halifax, Saint John, Quebec and other Canadian outlets.

I have dealt in the main with matters of particular consequence to the constituency I represent, or with national policies in their local application. I have left the international issues to be dealt with by those more directly concerned with the development of policy. However, I would not resume my seat without some reference to certain aspects of these questions on which I feel I must express a point of view.

Because of the sustained efforts being made to construe Canada's role at the United Nations as being hostile to our British connection, I think government spokesmen should re-emphasize the fact that the unity of the commonwealth is a primary objective of our foreign policy. There may well be differences of opinion on how that objective is to be served, but there should be no question of the objective itself. At the same time, I am shocked at the line of thought that whatever Britain does in international disputes, Canada should do likewise. This is as much as to say that the particular British government in power must necessarily be assumed to be right by Canadians even though it may not have the full support of the British people themselves; and that whether right or wrong, wise or unwise,