

*Transportation*

*Queen of Prince Rupert* and left that vessel at Prince Rupert with the intention of proceeding to some part of Alaska by way of the Alaska state ferry system. The truck was detained or confiscated. In any event something happened to it because United States officials said the law had been contravened in that part of the trip had been made in other than a United States ship.

However, when Canadian goods are being shipped we take a much more lenient point of view and permit without question the shipping of goods from one port in Canada to another port in Canada by way of United States vessels, for example, from Prince Rupert by the Alaska ferry system up to the Skeena River. A portion of these goods could be transported by us but this is not being done. If we had a government which took the least interest in the development of northern British Columbia and had continued assistance to that province under the roads to resources program we might not have to tolerate a situation where our goods are shipped in vessels owned by the United States. We might by now have seen the Stewart-Cassiar road in such a condition that the transfer of heavy materials by truck into the areas being developed north of Stewart and Prince Rupert would be possible.

This is an example of the history of blindness on the part of the present government concerning the need for the development of transportation on the coast of British Columbia and in the northern areas, and nowhere in this bill do I see even an inkling of an understanding of these problems. If the Canadian National Railways had any hope of promoting northern development, either that company or the government would have at least undertaken some time ago a survey looking toward the extension of the line northward through Hazelton to the Yukon panhandle and the Cassiar district so that the transport of goods and materials to this rapidly developing area just north of where I live might be possible.

It is incongruous that in his presentation of this bill the Minister of Transport should be making a great play about the necessity for expediting grain shipments while his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, is saying on the other hand that we do not need additional facilities at the grain elevator in Prince Rupert. The Minister of Transport talked about the great need for shipping large volumes of grain faster and more economically. I am certainly not unfavourably disposed

[Mr. Howard.]

toward more efficient grain handling or heavier grain shipments to other parts of the world, because this is a vital part of our economy and is no doubt of great value to the grain farmers on the prairies. But I am disturbed when I find one minister talking about the necessity for increasing grain shipments while another minister in the same government refuses to build the necessary extensions to a publicly owned terminal elevator in the city of Prince Rupert at the C.N.R. terminal point on its northern line.

There are two other aspects of this subject which I should like to mention before I finish. They are matters with which I believe the bill should have been concerned and which make me feel I cannot support the measure in its present form. They are the two vitally important questions with which this house and the whole nation were concerned only a few days ago.

I refer to the position in which railway workers find themselves not only with regard to their wages, hours and working conditions but as individuals faced with automation or technological change and the desire of the railway companies to run trains greater distances with the same crews. We appointed a royal commission to look into this question in great detail. Recently we have also seen more than 100,000 rail workers out on strike, not so much because they were concerned about their wages, though this was an important factor, but because they were concerned about the steadily declining opportunities for continuing work within the railway system. The men are concerned about the future of their jobs and the effect of automation and technological change upon their employment. They have lived in this atmosphere for the past 15 or 20 years since the advent of the diesel engine replacing steam. They have seen the decline of the old roundhouse, the laying off of certain classes of employees, including men with 15 to 20 years of service. They have seen terminal points closed because facilities were no longer needed. They see no end to the process.

We spent nearly the whole of last week dealing with one aspect of conditions on the railroads of this nation. Railway workers and others have been concerned for years about automation and the potential working life of a railroader. This is a question whose answer melts into vagueness when one considers the possible effects of automation. But the bill before us is silent on these matters. It is as