

of the rights of northern Canadians, to give those of us who live above the sixtieth parallel the same kind of voice as any other Canadian. The minister refuses to do it now. He has refused ever since he has been in that portfolio, and his predecessor refused to do it. So long as he occupies that post and so long as this government stays in office, we in the north will be regarded as colonials and second class citizens of Canada.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I understand the bill is to go through tonight, and only a minute or two remain. I should like to make one or two comments. We have seen an attack on two members of our party by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I want to tell this House and the people of Canada that these members have worked more for the ecological situation and parks in Canada than any member of the Tory party. The new member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth) has done a better job for the native people during his short time in this House of Commons than the member for Yukon in the entire period he has been here. There can be no doubt about that.

There is one point I should like to make to the minister before this debate closes. In speaking of national parks there is one more thing I wish to draw to his attention. I refer to the establishment of a very large number of ecological reserves from one end of Canada to the other. He knows about the activity which is going on in this field and I hope he will assist in the establishment of these reserves which could be used for research purposes in the years to come.

I see it is ten o'clock. There are other things I should like to say, but we will abide by the commitment to let the bill pass.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It appears that the House might be ready for the question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

● (2200)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### TRANSPORT—CONTINUITY OF CNR FERRY SERVICE TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND IN THE EVENT OF FUTURE LABOUR DISPUTES

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, my question, which I am raising again this evening, relates to a question that was asked on March 14, as recorded at page 505 of *Hansard*, with respect to the hoped for final solution with regard to the increasing frequency of disruptive rail ferry tie-ups primarily between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick and also, of course, since the time of

### Adjournment Debate

confederation with respect to Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

Hon. members will recall that in August of last year, during the latter part of the month, we were called back to Ottawa in order to pass legislation that would end the rail strike at that time. It is undoubtedly true that the strike created considerable difficulties for people all across Canada, but I think we must admit at the outset that there were two provinces that were more disastrously affected than any others, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

At the time of the debate, hon. members may also recall that I sought an assurance, and I think received one, from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) that some mechanism would be established after the resolution of that strike in order that we might have a permanent means of ensuring continuity of service, as guaranteed under confederation, between these two island provinces and the mainland. Some hon. members may be aware, as well, that following the passage of that legislation in September and October I addressed correspondence to the responsible Minister of Labour and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) as well as to the premiers of the two island provinces. In the first letter, dated September 14, I merely laid out the facts again and re-emphasized what had been said during the debate on August 31, that the departments of labour and transport must come to grips with the CNR, in this instance, and with the respective unions in order to work out a format that would be acceptable to all parties.

On October 9 I laid out a specific alternative, quite a radical one and one that received a fair amount of public discussion at the time. Therefore, on March 14 I concluded, after passage of more than half a year that it was quite likely that either the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Labour would be able to report on satisfactory progress. I was shocked to discover from the answer that I received initially from the Minister of Transport that there was a protest being carried out with respect to this problem. That was a pretty vague answer to the important question that was before him. Even later, the Minister of Labour said that officials from his department had been meeting with officials of appropriate unions in an endeavour to work out some acceptable arrangements to make sure there would not be a work stoppage in the future.

You can imagine my shock to see across my desk two or three days ago a press release from the Minister of Labour indicating that he was pleased with the results of his first meeting with Canada's top rail union leaders to discuss alternatives to confrontation during forthcoming negotiations for new contracts in the railway industry. What has the minister been doing for the last six months? Why, in spite of the correspondence not only from myself but, I am sure, from other concerned members from these two island provinces and from provincial officials, has literally nothing taken place?

We are told the following in this press release of March 27:

The thrust of the recommendations made by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall... as well as the alternatives suggested by labour minister Munro were examined in detail—

We are not given any indication of what the minister's alternatives were. Finally, in this release we are told that