Adjournment Debate

Christmas the *Lumba Lumba*, the boat that was supposed to provide such great service to Ocean Falls, has been there four times, twice in the middle of the night when the residents of Ocean Falls did not even know that it had come there.

On March 4, just two weeks ago, I put a question to the Minister of Transport. I asked him, regarding his recent visit to Victoria, whether the government would now present a 50 per cent subsidy to help the ferry system in British Columbia. The minister again gave a very inadequate answer, so I put a supplementary question to him:

Since the new improved shipping arrangement for the west coast is now four months old, and it is a makeshift proposition, are we to assume that this will now be a permanent arrangement, or will there be an announcement concerning a new arrangement?

I take up the Vancouver *Province*, and today I understand there is another statement which I would like to read into the record:

Transport Minister Otto Lang promised an inquiry in December, and earlier this week four regional districts sent a telegram to Lang saying the inquiry was long overdue and should be called immediately. Although she didn't have any special knowledge, Campagnolo said: "As far I am concerned it will still be heard but if there is a transfer of jurisdiction from federal to provincial then it's hard to say what will happen."

The latest word which I have just heard from the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) is that RivTow is to have a subsidy. This is the system which was not to require any subsidy. All that the communities along the coast of British Columbia have received from the Minister of Transport is promises and delays. According to the announcement in the Vancouver *Province* what we have is another delay.

There is supposed to be an inquiry. We know that that is the surest way of getting another stall. It is a gimmick. I feel sorry for the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. Pearsall) because he has been working hard for those communities, and the Minister of Transport, and the Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) have given him the shaft. It is time that the coastal communities got an answer—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am always impressed by the presentations made by the hon. member during the late show, and I am also impressed by the representations made by the Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) (Mrs. Campagnolo) on this matter.

The hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) alleges that there are disparities between subsidies paid to ferry services on the east and west coasts. This view appears to be based on a straight comparison of numerical totals and does not take into consideration the basic purpose of a subsidy program, which is to iron out unfair disparities and not to establish some sort of mathematical balance. Subsidies of the type administered by the Department of Transport are not handed out on a percentage basis but are calculated on the basis of evaluated need. In such circumstances it is possible

that 100 per cent of all subsidies could be paid in one area and there would still be no question of disparity.

In drawing comparisons between the east and west coasts, the extent to which transportation assistance in any form may be required is clearly a function of geography and climate. In the east the main ferry services provide linkage between the Atlantic provinces. This should be contrasted with the situation in British Columbia where the coastal shipping services, including the ferries, are an integral part of the provincial communications network, and to a considerable extent play the role of intra-provincial highways.

The scale of subsidization on the east coast is, of course, primarily dependent on the constitutional commitments which were made by Canada at the time of entry of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland into Confederation. Although the current levels of expenditure may be much higher than were originally envisaged, the constitutional obligations cannot be avoided. The nature of the geographical area and the dispersed population inevitably lead to heavy expenditures which, even without a constitutional amendment, could not easily be supported by what is relatively one of the poorer areas of Canada.

The situation in British Columbia is very different. This prosperous province enjoys the benefits of a mature transportation system in which subsidization has in fact been a disruptive element rather than a support. Indeed transportation services in British Columbia waters can to a large extent be effectively provided through normal market processes.

There is no constitutional commitment to British Columbia contained in the terms of Confederation since the province did not see marine transportation services as being as high on its scale of priorities as did the island provinces in the east.

With due allowance made for Canada's constitutional obligations, the government has been striving to establish a water transportation assistance policy—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the parliamentary secretary that his allotted time has expired.

MANPOWER—CANADA WORKS PROGRAM—DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN STATUS INDIANS ON AND OFF RESERVATIONS

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my rising tonight in the adjournment debate stems from a question I asked of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) which is reported at page 2777 of Hansard, and also from a question the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) asked which is reported at page 3521 of Hansard. My question also follows upon a speech I made with regard to employment and immigration which is found at page $350\overline{5}$ of Hansard.

I want to zero in tonight on the Canada Works program and explain exactly what took place over a very short period of time. The first letter I received informing me of the Canada Works program was dated December 20. I received no more communications in this regard until I received a letter on