

Transportation

levels of transportation. Rail transportation has been going through a transition in that part of the country, as it has in many other parts of the country.

We have lost all our branch lines; we are down to one passenger train a day, as hon. members will recall from the discussions that took place earlier on in this session. We even have difficulty with truck transportation because we are under the overwhelming influence of that large metropolitan urban community in Manitoba, the city of Winnipeg, where truck activities tend to be concentrated and where rates tend to be established.

We are also facing another difficulty at the moment which I hope will be overcome shortly, and that is uncertainty which has existed now for the past several months regarding the regional air policy. As the minister assured me yesterday, a hearing is to take place in October to determine the future of a regional air policy for this particular part of western Canada.

The point which I am making and which I wish to bring to the minister's attention is simply that it is fine to emphasize national policy but I hope he will ensure that the undue emphasis on national policy will not overshadow the new and encouraging trend which has been manifested in the Department of Industry to overcome a natural handicap which has affected particularly the extreme eastern and extreme western parts of Canada ever since confederation. It is because of this fact that hon. members become so exercised whenever any major change is made in the transportation policy. By all means let us rationalize transportation policy, but in the process of rationalization let us remember that Canada cannot be regarded as one, integrated economic entity.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder whether I could ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is he not in favour of one Canada?

Mr. Dinsdale: I am in favour of one Canada in the political sense, but I am also aware of the fact that we have four or five Canadas in the economic and geographic sense.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman had better be careful or he will be excommunicated by his leader in the morning.

Mr. Dinsdale: I am just repeating the belief of the leader of this party that there is one Canada in terms of political unity. This has

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

been the remarkable achievement of successive governments, particularly the government of John A. Macdonald, whose achievement will be commemorated next year when we celebrate our hundredth anniversary. However, we still have the facts of geography, typography and economics to deal with.

Let us now deal with the super board which has not been recommended in the MacPherson report and so far as I can determine has not been discussed with the provincial governments most concerned. It is a part of the current trend toward bigness in almost every major aspect of life.

● (9:50 p.m.)

In so far as the military are concerned, the government's emphasis is on unification and integration. We talk about big government, about solidarity forever and big labour; big bureaucracy. Even in the church we are engaged in discussions about the possibility of church unity. I remember a discussion I had with a member of the United Church when I was overseas, as a matter of fact a United Church padre. The good folk in England were not familiar with the concept of the United Church, and being a member of a non-conformist group I had to explain that we were of the opinion it was not so much a case of being united as it was a case of being frozen together.

This is always a problem with bigness in any sphere of life. The chairman is going to be all powerful; the deputy minister is going to be all powerful and certainly the minister is going to be all powerful under the legislation that is contemplated. He knows, of course, that the essence of democracy is the separation and division of powers. I know that integration is put forward in the interests of efficiency. The argument is always presented that if you have unification and integration of this kind you have greater efficiency. One of the nations that has been most forthright in this whole policy of integration and unification has been the Soviet state. It of course, has become almost one great monolithic unit in terms of bigness. However, it is faced with the inevitable situation that always confronts a big bureaucracy or a monolithic government, namely that when a mistake is made it is always a great, big blooper. It is not a small mistake, it is a big one.

At the transport seminar the other day I raised this particular point, and it was suggested to me this would be avoided because of the cross fertilization that would occur