

*Newfoundland Ferry Service*

mover of the motion intends to remove the right to strike of those employees engaged in the ferry service between the mainland and the island.

**Mr. Carter:** That is wrong.

**Mr. Caccia:** That is a logical conclusion, because the mover of the motion was silent about this. It would certainly facilitate this debate if he had the courage to say that he is against giving the right to strike to these particular employees. Then we would know exactly what is the purpose of the motion. If my assumption is correct—

**Mr. Marshall:** It is your assumption.

**Mr. Caccia:**—the hon. member would remove the right to strike in order that this service could be maintained on a continuous year-round basis, and thereby fulfil the needs and requirements of the people who live on the island.

Apparently the hon. member wishes to remove the right to strike. Let me point out that legislation prohibiting strikes does not necessarily lead to the elimination of strikes and other patterns of labour unrest. Sometimes it leads to exactly the contrary result, labour unrest. In this case that might undermine even more the continuity of service about which the hon. member is so concerned. Obviously his way would be the wrong way to go about this.

If you want to make sure that this service is available and not interrupted, you should make sure that the kind of agreement which is signed will satisfy the hopes and aspirations of the men. Certainly you cannot maintain service by introducing legislation to prohibit strikes because your purpose will not be accomplished.

We know that this House in 1967 gave workers in the public service the right to strike. This right became part of their free collective bargaining process. Obviously in view of that decision of Parliament this government does not wish to interfere with the rights of any segment of the public service. If you want to remove the rights of the ferry workers you could also say, "Why not do it for the air traffic controllers, or the firemen in Vancouver, or for other sectors?" If that is your position, you might as well have the courage to say, "Abolish the right to strike of public employees, period".

● (1740)

Perhaps in a moment of ecstasy at their meeting in Ottawa in February the Progressive Conservatives forgot to pass that resolution. They reconfirmed the leadership with a vote of six hundred and some odd delegates. According to the papers that was only a quarter of the enrolled delegates.

**Mr. Marshall:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member should stick to the motion. He does not know what he is talking about. This is stupid and ridiculous. Probably the only time the hon. member has seen a boat was at a sportsmen show. He should either be put straight or the motion should be put to a vote.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The hon. member had an opportunity to make his speech. Unless he has a valid

[Mr. Caccia.]

point of order we will return to the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia).

**Mr. Caccia:** It is true that even my best friends could not claim I am an expert on ferry boats, although we do have ferry boats in Toronto which connect the islands with the mainland. They are a fascinating feature of our style of life on Lake Ontario. That is one point.

I will now deal with a major point raised by the hon. member in the motion he has put forward, namely, the question of the guarantee and obligation to ensure continuous and uninterrupted transportation service. Continuous and uninterrupted can only be interpreted to mean one thing. How else can that be achieved except by removing the right to strike? The hon. member may not like my interpretation, but he chose to be silent on how he would accomplish this. Therefore it is perfectly legitimate for the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) and others to interpret it in that way.

It is a well known fact that groups in society who do not have a right to strike fall back badly in their economic conditions. A typical example is the hospital workers. Look at the desperate economic conditions in which they have to work and support their families. The hon. member in his motion is suggesting that those engaged in ferry boat service should work under the same conditions as those who do not enjoy the right to strike. Without the right to strike how can they improve their economic lot?

Is that the kind of policy the Conservatives want to put to the Canadian people? Is that the kind of progress they would like to see? If that is the case they can have it because it is regression, not progression.

History is full of ideas of this kind. It is a well known fact that when people are well paid and their pay is comparable with other sectors of society, they do not withdraw their services. No one in this House could deny that. For example, have members ever heard of chairmen of boards, or presidents of large corporations going on strike? Have members of the Conservative party ever heard of people in the higher brackets of the corporate world going on strike? Obviously not. Why not? One need only look at the financial section of last Thursday's *Globe and Mail* which listed individuals earning between \$200,000 and \$300,000 a year. This list gives the incomes of these persons and the companies for which they work.

Because some people in our society can command such an income does that mean the chairman of the board of General Motors is worth 60 times the amount earned by a man engaged in ferry boat service? Certainly not. It is because we do not believe in that kind of assumption that we believe in protecting the right to strike for those in society who have been able to achieve it.

I can see from the expression on the face of the mover of this motion that he does not understand the implication of what he has moved. Probably that is his problem. Anyone who reads this motion will understand that continuous and uninterrupted service means removing the right to strike from the people involved. How can it mean anything less than that?

The mover had better understand the consequences of his motion. The onus was on him to clarify it in his speech. He did not do that. He only talked about the right under