

highly technical vessel to serve the oil rigs in the North Sea. Canadian companies are leasing these vessels to the exploration companies. Not long ago I witnessed a launching of one such vessel.

I learned that Canadian companies could not man these ships with Canadian crews. The pay was between \$20,000 and \$30,000. You would be three weeks on and three weeks off. Your family would live in Spain, and you would be flown back and forth if you served on such a ship. The working conditions and quality of employment were the best I have seen. Yet it was difficult to man that ship. A crew could not be found in British Columbia. The company searched across Canada for personnel to man the ship. That again is another factor to which the government has paid insufficient attention by including clause 8 as worded. For that reason I should like to see this aspect of clause 8 not included in the bill.

In October, 1974, the former minister of transport promised the institution of an efficient waiver system which would allow the use of foreign ships if Canadian ships were unavailable at suitable rates or were unsuitable for the task at hand. If the government intends to include clause 8 in this housekeeping bill I should like to see some guarantee being given with regard to that promised waiver provision.

Again I ask, if you insist on Canadian bottoms moving B.C. products, primary and secondary products, to eastern Canadian markets, who will own the bottoms and will they operate at competitive rates? I suppose they will be owned by Canada Steamship, or a consortium involving Canada Steamship, or one involving the railroads. If the railroads are involved in the ownership of Canadian bottoms serving British Columbia we shall lose the last vestige of hope for obtaining competitive rail rates for moving our products efficiently to consumers in the east.

It is my judgment that it is better to tackle this problem by giving tax incentives in place of subsidy incentives. If you provide tax incentives, industry will find the most efficient answer. Industry will be more efficient than the bureaucracy. I am opposed to this bureaucratic meddling in B.C. industry. It restricts the freedom of our industry.

I was interested to note that the B.C. transport minister has expressed the same concern I have expressed in the House this evening. He said that the Jones Act has worked to the disadvantage of industries in Oregon and Washington competing with British Columbia. We shall neutralize that advantage if we include clause 8 as written in Bill C-61. There can be only one result for B.C. shippers;—increased cost of delivering B.C. products to eastern Canadian markets.

As an alternative we could continue using other countries' bottoms. We could discharge the goods at non-Canadian ports, then ship them by rail or truck to eastern Canadian markets. But that makes no sense. For that reason I contend that the government has not deliberated enough on the need for a rewording of clause 8. It works to the disadvantage of the industries and people of British Columbia. I am glad that Mr. Davis, the B.C. transport minister, now sees the producers' point of view. He was not concerned, I understand, when this subject matter was considered in 1973. He at that time raised no objection to the inclusion of clause 8, as presently worded.

Maritime Code

In closing I urge the Department of Transport, the Minister of Transport, and the parliamentary secretary to delete clause 8 in its present form from the bill as it will work a disincentive to the industries and people of British Columbia.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Originally it was agreed that motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3 would be voted on and discussed together, under certain conditions. In the light of the later agreement is there unanimous consent to withdraw motions Nos. 2 and 3 from the grouping?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. James Richardson (for the Minister of Transport) moved motion No. 5:

That Bill C-61, to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other Acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be amended in Clause 11 of the French version by deleting subclause (2) at pages 14 and 15 and substituting the following therefor:

“(2) La Commission canadienne des transports ne peut délivrer la licence prévue au paragraphe (1) que si le requérant la convainc

a) qu'il est dans l'intérêt public d'utiliser un navire autre qu'un navire canadien compte tenu de l'usage particulier auquel le navire visé par la demande est destiné;

b) que le navire visé par la demande présente les caractéristiques nécessaires à cet usage.”

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the comments I made on the first motion apply to this motion also. The principle is the same, no substantive change is being made in the effect of this clause. This, simply, is a technical amendment, to make the French language version of the bill correspond with the English version. Comments made with regard to the importance of making both versions the same are relevant here as well.

● (2150)

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Do I understand that the remarks that were just made were directed to motion No. 5 and that we have up until now been discussing motions Nos. 1 and 5 together, or were we just discussing motion No. 1? I am really confused.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Motions Nos. 1 and 5. We withdrew motions Nos. 2 and 3 from the grouping. Is the House ready for the question? The question is on motion No. 1 and motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was wondering whether the government House leader was paying any attention to us tonight. Possibly we can defer any and all results until some point in the future because there will be votes. It might be easier to dispose of this at one time and now move to motion No. 2.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Could we not now agree on division?

Mr. Papproski: On division.