

*Supply—Transport*

**Mr. Winch:** Mr. Chairman, may I in answer to the hon. gentleman say that that question was asked during the last session, and that complete information was given by the federal treasury board as to the amount of money that was contributed to the construction of those ships. If the hon. gentleman truly wants an answer to his questions, let him consult treasury board or look up *Hansard* for last year. The federal government did contribute under the shipbuilding subsidy system, but why is there now a change in policy? Why will this subsidy, which seriously affects one province, the province of British Columbia, no longer apply?

Mr. Chairman, is this change in policy not peculiar or do many of us just have suspicious minds in thinking this policy change, as announced on January 17, is a result of the outcome of the election on November 8—an election in respect of which the premier of the province of British Columbia went out on the hustings throughout the province telling the electorate: For God's sake, do what you want, but don't vote Liberal?

**Mr. Herridge:** And he tried to defeat the hon. member for Kootenay West.

**Mr. Winch:** Is this change a form of retaliation? Is it persecution? Mr. Chairman, it is only my opinion, but it is my opinion, that this is retaliation against the government of British Columbia, and persecution of the ferry system of that province. It is my opinion that behind all this lies a Machiavellian-Liberal plan of retaliation. If you look in a dictionary of the future, to which an hon. gentleman was just referring, you might find that one of the definitions of a Machiavellian-political plan is a "Pickersgillian plan".

We have invested \$48 million in the British Columbia ferry service, and that is not the end of our investment. Already there is in the planning stage a number of new ships. Why should the government of British Columbia not be able to utilize the B.C. shipyards to get the same advantages offered private enterprise? The C.P.R. operates a ferry service between Vancouver and Nanaimo. Under the new policy, if the C.P.R. wants to extend its ferry service by building new ships, it will be entitled to the subsidy, if the new ships are built in Canadian yards. Why should a crown corporation owned by the people of British Columbia not have the same right and privilege of operating under the same policy as private enterprise? I said I could see a "Pickersgillian-Machiavellian" policy here.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Do you know what I think it is? I believe that because the government knows that British Columbia is going to advance, and that its ferry system is going to advance, it is endeavouring to place the government of British Columbia in a position where, on a costing basis it will have to go outside British Columbia for the construction of these new ships—perhaps to Japan. Then the government could point the finger of scorn at British Columbia. I would not be surprised, if we could get some honesty from the other side, to find that this thinking has been and still is in their minds.

I want to repeat with all the force at my command that every member from British Columbia, irrespective of party, takes the position that we do not want anything extra for that province. However, we do ask for equity of policy and treatment in British Columbia. We ask that an end be put to discrimination against this province because we happen to be in advance of other provinces, and have a publicly owned and magnificent ferry service. We hope there will be a reconsideration by the Minister of Transport in the immediate future.

I said I wished to refer to two subjects, Mr. Chairman. The second relates to the lack of any policy for the development or redevelopment of the port of Vancouver. As I mentioned earlier, this matter was referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra last evening during his very well thought out and factual presentation. We have not been talking about this subject, but the lower mainland members undoubtedly have reached the point of such ultimate concern about this situation that they have all been making investigations.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra told us that this dispute of ownership of properties on the foreshore of Vancouver harbour dated back to 1934. Apparently I delved a little further back than the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra because I discovered, and I know my information is factual—it must be because I got it from the legal department here in Ottawa—that the dispute in respect of the ownership between the Vancouver Harbour Board, the Federal Government and the C.P.R. dates back to the year 1900.

● (4:20 p.m.)

There have been 65 years of dispute as to who owns this valuable waterfront property in Vancouver harbour. Successive Liberal and Tory governments for 65 years have not been