

is done, where Canadian ships are operating, the Government is going to say: "Look at what we have done. After five years we have developed a policy or a program to take one more of hundreds and hundreds of looks at what we have had. See what we are doing to provide a Canadian merchant fleet".

Two things have to happen. This Government, even in the time available, could put in place Transport Canada policies that would enhance Canadian registered ships. Without coming to Parliament, they could do something constructive to enhance the manufacture of Canadian ships, Canadian-operated ships, and ensure that Canadian crews are on those ships. There are dredges in the Arctic carrying foreign crews in Canadian waters.

A complaint was made recently to the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts), a man travelling this country saying that he wants to be the leader of his Party, which would like to remain in Government, that he signed an order to allow foreign crews on a Canadian ship. That was done just the other day. It is simply not acceptable. We know what has to go into place to develop a Canadian marine industrial strategy. That strategy within Transport Canada, within Customs and Excise, within the taxation policy areas, can be effectively carried out.

Before us today is a fairly constructive move. It is a passive move. It is not a move by a Government that is showing aggressiveness or clear concern for an industry that for years has been neglected. Nevertheless, it is one small move. There must be many more following. With that I will conclude my remarks. I hope this Bill passes quickly.

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, the good faith of the Government was indicated when the Minister refused to answer questions with respect to his consultations with the fishing industry concerning the removal of the exemption of 100-foot shipping vessels. The answer is that the Government wants to continue allowing foreign shipyards to bring ships into Canada and exploit the resources of Canada to the detriment of Atlantic Canada and the ship workers of Canada. This must stop.

If you read the Schedule, you find that it exempts ships and other vessels exceeding 30.5 metres registered length for use in commercial fishing industry. The item is tariff 44002-1. It says British preferential tariff free, most favoured nation tariff free, Saudi Arabia tariff 25 per cent, General preferential tariff free. It is only vessels used in commercial fishing.

A vessel is brought in, used for a day in commercial fishing, it is into Canada for free and that's it. This loophole represents a hole in this Bill so wide you could drive the whole—I was going to say the army through with all its tanks, but we have not got that many. It is a hole in the Bill that must be corrected or this Bill will be virtually meaningless.

Some years ago we declared a 200-mile limit. We extended the boundaries of Canada 200 miles out to sea so that we would be able to exploit the commercial resources of the continental shelf. What does this Government do? Up until now it leaves the 200-mile area totally free for anybody and

### *Customs and Excise*

his brother to exploit. It is supposed to monitor the number of fish taken off the Atlantic Coast. It does not do that very well. It should do everything to ensure that the jobs in shipbuilding, manufacturing, resource exploitation, equipment, food, supplies, are in Canada, and that all that is used in resource exploitation on this extended limit of Canada is purchased from Canadian manufacturers, Canadian suppliers, or impose tariffs.

This Bill is supposed to do that, but what does it do? As far as drilling rigs are concerned, the ones that are presently under lease, they are okay. As far as coasting vessels are concerned, the ones presently operating, they are okay. They do not have to pay tariffs. Only the new ones might have to pay tariffs, but they will probably come in as fishing vessels for use in commercial fishing. They will be used for commercial fishing for a day. Then they can do the coasting trade and not be subject to any tariff.

This is the hoax we are being asked to support and the Minister refuses to answer questions. I ask why? He knows we will get to him. He knows we will ask the questions that will embarrass him. Therefore he hides under the rules. What kind of Government would hide under the rules and pretend that it is doing something for the shipbuilding industry in this country?

The Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons), who has the Marystown yard in his riding, knows what will happen to him. He has been pestering the Minister to do something about it. It is not just members on this side who think that this exemption should go. Members from all over Atlantic Canada think this exemption should go.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Order, please. The Chair has allowed a certain leniency this afternoon by permitting Members to go into what should be discussed at committee stage, that is referring to specific clauses. Because it felt that an agreement might be reached, if the Government agreed to make an amendment, this was done. I cannot allow the Hon. Member to base his whole speech on this particular clause. It is jumping the gun. We will deal with this in committee stage, if we ever reach that stage.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** On the point you have raised, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that this is a Bill that in pith and substance is imposing a tariff on vessels being brought into Canada, and the Canadian limit for the purpose of determining the importation is the continental shelf or the 200-mile limit. That is what we are talking about. This Bill is to levy a tariff on ships and other things now being brought into the 200-mile extraterritorial part of Canada and do not now any duty. The Bill extends the limit so that those goods are subject to duty. That is the purpose of the Bill. The trouble is, the Bill does not do that. The Bill is supposed to do that. It is only proper at second reading to point that out. It was always my feeling that at second reading we were entitled to debate the nature of the Bill. That is the purpose of second reading debate. That is where the problem is—