

Canada Shipping Act

be no arbitration. The Coast Guard can charge whomsoever it pleases, whether it helps them or not. The Coast Guard can be on standby for weeks and the standby charges are actually attributed to the vessels which may or may not be caught in the ice. This is a loaded gun pointed at the Government's own Crown corporation, and this concerns me greatly. It is unfair.

We in Atlantic Canada were just beginning to rediscover shipping. In the early days before Confederation, Atlantic Canada was one of the most successful parts of British North America. After Confederation, the banks that began in Nova Scotia invested 19 out of every 20 Nova Scotian dollars they received in central Canada. At that time, it was the shipping industry to the West Indies and the northeastern United States that was the bread and butter of Atlantic Canada. We are now beginning to realize that and are hoping to get back into shipping in a bigger way. However, we are going to be stumped by the provisions of this Bill.

If we are going to develop any kind of industry in Atlantic Canada, we have to utilize the cheaper means of shipping. Atlantic Canada is in tide water and shipping goods is much cheaper than sending them by truck or train. However, this Bill will be a real kick in the teeth not only to the shipping and transportation industries but to the entire concept of regional development in Atlantic Canada.

What is the next step? Is the Government going to charge truckers for the use of snow-ploughs on the highways? That may sound ridiculous to some Hon. Members. It is no more ridiculous than charging the ships in Atlantic Canada for ice-breaking.

Mr. Forrestall: But it recovers 85 per cent of its cost.

Mr. MacLellan: If this were to be applied equally, provinces would charge trucking companies for snow-plough services. Fair is fair.

We are not only talking about the industry, we are talking about people. The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) has been very concerned about people in the

transportation industry in his own region who have lost their jobs. The Hon. Member knows what it is like when someone employed by CN Marine or CN Rail loses his job. I am not talking about young people who have been employed by CN for only two months. I am talking about people who have 10, 15 or 20 years of seniority and have worked for these Crown corporations for a long time. These people still have mortgages on their homes and their children have grown up and are attending university, a very expensive proposition. Not only that, these people have lived in the same communities all their lives. If a person has worked and lived in North Sydney for 20 years and is phased out of his job, and if he is offered another job in Moose Jaw, Montreal or Moncton, that person should be excused if he does not jump up and down in glee. There must be an understanding of that kind of a situation.

This reflex action of laying people off from the CN system has to stop. Often they are laid off without any benefits. In some cases there are pre-retirement leave plans but in most cases there are not and often some employees do not even have pension plans. This is a very serious situation about which I am very concerned.

We are not talking about wealth shippers when dealing with the Canada Ports Corporation. We are talking about shippers who may have financial difficulties. We are talking about fishermen and we are talking about anyone who uses the water, according to this Bill. It is an alarming Bill and one that must be studied in much greater depth before we do something very damaging, the repercussions of which will be very severe in Atlantic Canada for many years to come.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is one minute to six. May I call it six o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.