

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### TRADE—DEVELOPMENT OF U.S. MARKETS FOR ATLANTIC PROVINCES' PRODUCTS—TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, on December 10, two days after the Prime Minister's speech in Saint John, New Brunswick, I asked him to indicate what plans he and his government had made to facilitate the movement of goods from the Maritimes into what he described as the "great consumer market of the United States seaboard". In his Saint John speech, not so lurid as some of his recent utterances but nevertheless an interesting one, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) referred to, in his words, "an unprecedented opportunity to take advantage of shifting trade patterns". In the same connection he referred to an opportunity for a much improved economic future in the Maritimes.

Increased trade with the eastern United States is not a recent aspiration of the people of the Maritime provinces. In the days before confederation a good deal of our prosperity was based upon commerce between our region, the New England states and adjoining parts of that great republic. Much of our economic depression and recession developed from the dislocation of our trade with this region, resultant from confederation. This is an old story but one which still means a great deal to Maritime people. Thus, when the Prime Minister painted his glowing picture of new trade movements to the south, he doubtless struck a responsive chord in his audience and rekindled the interest of our people.

My question to him then, and I repeat it now, concerns the efforts of the government of Canada to make possible an improvement in trade between the Maritimes and the eastern United States. In the first place, consideration would have to be given to easing tariff restraints. This is a matter which has been discussed for some time. When my hon. friend from Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. Flemming) was Premier of New Brunswick he made constant allusions to the need for taking note of our special trade problems in the Atlantic region. But apart from the tariff we must look at transportation opportunities. We can certainly produce choice products of sea and soil. We have, as the Prime Minister mentioned, a skilled labour force; we have the traditions of competent production. But we must have the facilities to move our goods quickly from production areas to markets.

I therefore asked the Prime Minister, and I ask again, what his government will do to allow Maritime goods to move quickly from the Maritimes to the new markets which he so glowingly described last December. Will he reverse his repudiation of the government's promise to build the Northumberland Causeway so that Island farmers and fishermen may get their produce quickly south? Will he make a big new effort to give major assistance to the corridor road? Will he and his government give the

### Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

necessary impetus and the necessary wherewithal to get the Fundy tidal power project under way? This important undertaking would work wonders for the economy of the region—and certainly no one needs to prove that there is a market for power: in the northeast United States indeed there is a crying need for it, and the capacity to fill this need is existing in the Fundy.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Again, in the realm of transportation I ask what is being done to upgrade the airports, to assist in shipping subsidies, to move quickly on the provision of boats which could carry produce quickly and easily from our ports to ports in the south. These, I believe, are the kind of practical things which the government of Canada should do to bring into reality the very enchanting vision which the Prime Minister presented to the people of Saint John last December.

**Mr. Barnett J. Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I was moved by the eloquent words of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) on behalf of the region of the country from which he comes. Before proceeding further I should like, on behalf of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) to apologize for a reference by my colleague, as reported at page 2795 of *Hansard* for January 26, to the hon. member for Hillsborough not turning up for a debate which was scheduled. This was quite in error. There was a misunderstanding over the arrangement made that the debate would not take place at that time; the parliamentary secretary was not aware of that. While we may not agree with the hon. member for Hillsborough's politics, certainly he can never be faulted for being an eloquent and diligent member of the House, always in attendance not only when he is required but when he is not required. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs particularly asked me to express his apology at this time.

Regrettably, the only province or territory in this country that I have not visited is the province partially represented, though I think totally represented in heart, by the hon. member for Hillsborough. The question, as I understood it, was directed to the Northumberland Causeway, though he covered many more areas of particular interest in his discourse this evening. The question is a difficult one that has faced virtually every government since they "built" Prince Edward Island. I refer to putting something between it and the mainland. It has become a bit of a sad joke on the part of politicians, particularly at election time, to discuss the great prospect of such a causeway. This government, I submit, has never made any such promise. On the contrary, our promise was to look at things carefully and to see what is practical and economic.

I would not think for a moment that the hon. member for Hillsborough was suggesting that a project that all reasonable studies have considered uneconomic should be proceeded with. There might, of course, be some dispute