

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

We protest the action of Great Lakes shipping on all these counts and feel action should be taken by the Canadian parliament to prevent such things happening in the future.

Yours very truly,
George H. MacDonald,
President.

I hope that whoever replies to this letter of grievance will be in a position to elaborate a little on what the government may have in mind with regard to the situations I have mentioned.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I was given notice of this question today. I was not in the house when my hon. friend raised it initially. I made some inquiries in the interim, and while the basic facts appear to be as they were represented by my friend, as yet in any event, the registry of shipping has not been advised of this intention. There has been no formal representation or application for this transfer or no indication that it is coming. I have had, as has my hon. friend, representations from the area, and I assume there is no reason to suspect that this is not the action that is contemplated now.

So far as the general statements that were made by the hon. member are concerned, I think I have to say that the situation is not precisely as he has stated. In the first instance, the vessel's owners have met with the requirements laid down in the current legislation with regard to retention of ownership for a period of years in return for the subsidy. I believe it is five years after the subsidy is given that the vessel must remain under Canadian registry. It is also extremely difficult to determine whether, as one of the representations stated, these vessels should remain under Canadian registry forever. I suspect there would be some argument from the Canadian shipbuilding industry on this score, as well as from shipping interests. I mention this simply to highlight one of the difficulties that exists in the whole shipbuilding industry in Canada, that is that there is a wide diversity and conflict of views among the different groups that make up this important industry.

All of this aside, I am in complete sympathy with the plight of a crew that is replaced in this fashion. I would like to be able to give a commitment and to say that we could change the situation or that there was some way in which we could prevent this kind of thing from happening. I would be less than

honest, though, if I did not recognize and point out to the house the interlocking difficulties that arise here. I will be more than pleased, and in fact I have already initiated some inquiries, to see whether or not we can, if it is in the best interests of the country or of the seamen concerned, make some more stringent regulations in this regard. But again I can only emphasize that it has been my experience that we have to anticipate the reactions to this kind of action, and I hope these will not be detrimental. In other words, I hope that by closing one door we would not be opening up a situation which would be of even greater seriousness or which would be detrimental to Canadian industry or Canadian workers.

I have taken note of the hon. member's representations and I make an undertaking now to look into this matter as quickly as possible, first of all in the light of the particular incident to which he has drawn my attention, and secondly to determine whether any review is possible under the circumstances I have outlined.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—PRINCE RUPERT
—MONITORING TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank Your Honour for letting me bring this matter before the house tonight because, although it is perhaps not an issue of national character it is one of real local urgency. On the other hand, if this local dispute is a valid example of the general stupidity of Postmasters across Canada, then I think the boiling cauldron of postal unrest which is apparently beginning to show signs of some tranquillity will erupt once again to the discomfort of the minister and of all those employed by the department. Therefore, this is a very serious matter indeed.

I understand that labour-management relations in the Prince Rupert Post Office, to which I refer, have been delicate for some time. Unprovable allegations of racial discrimination have been whispered about arising from the fact that the president of the local happens to be of east Indian ancestry. This accounts for some of the difficulties in labour-management relations at this post office. What led to the current controversy were, the tactless and stupid statements made by the postmaster, Mr. Doug Layton, in the course of an address to the local chamber of commerce reported as a front page item in the Prince Rupert *Daily News* of May 6. I