

bottom line. The Government of Canada is now even interfering with the freedom of, dare I say it, young romantics to go out for a row on the lake in the evening with nothing more than their oars to keep them company. I cannot believe it. It is a shocking and insensitive Bill.

I have both oars in the water and I am barrelling straight ahead. The problem is that the Government of Canada obviously did not have its navigation straightened out when it decided to come to the House with this piece of legislation. It has no idea where it will end up.

The Prince Edward Island Potato Marketing Board also has something to say about the Bill. We now have the fellow who is going for a row with his wife in the evening and a bottle of wine upset about this Bill. The potato farmers of P.E.I. are upset about this Bill. The prairie farmers are upset about the Bill. The fishermen on the last bill of Cape St. George on the southwest coast of Newfoundland sitting on their lobster pots watching the sun go down are upset at the Government because of this Bill. The people in the steel and glass towers of the Iron Ore Company of Canada are upset about this Bill. The fellow who looks out across the Vancouver skyline at the tall trees that keep the engine and the economy of that province going is upset about this Bill. In the history of this Parliament could there possibly have been a piece of legislation that more negatively affected so many different Canadians from so many different parts of Canada in so many different circumstances who have all come to a unanimous conclusion about Clause 4 of Bill C-75?

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Tobin: Thank God!

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I need some clarification on the type of activity that is taking place in the House today. Would Your Honour make some judgment about the quality of the input today? We have heard about Johnny and the Kool-Aid. We have heard about all kinds of irrelevancies. There has been the odd solid point speaking out on behalf of the people of Canada. But did you not notice, Mr. Speaker, the irrelevancies in the speech and the tremendous abuse of Parliament that has been taking place until now? I realize that the previous speaker needed a breath of air. I wonder if Your Honour might make a judgment on the matter before us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member does have unlimited time. The Chair finds that his speech is relevant.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from the New Democratic Party for giving the Speaker an opportunity to express something that he could not otherwise express. Every Member of the House knows that the Speaker must be regarded as being strictly neutral. He has an obligation not to show partisanship in the House. He has an obligation to be a sphinx. He has to be like the great Tower of London that stands unmoved by the events that occur around it. The Hon.

Canada Shipping Act

Member from the New Democratic Party has given the Speaker, who is from the great Province of Quebec, a chance to say what I know he has been dying to say. It gave him a chance to say: "I too, with all that is in me, am opposed to this Draconian piece of legislation". On your behalf, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member from the New Democratic Party for giving you an opportunity to rise and say how much you oppose this legislation by indicating that what I am saying is rather—

● (1500)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member knows that he should not bring the Speaker into the debate.

Mr. Tobin: That is okay, Mr. Speaker, you can thank me afterwards. There will be one Tory elected in Quebec and we will put him back in the chair after the next election.

The Great Lakes Commission has said the following about Clause 4 of Bill C-75:

We are particularly concerned about possible compounding effects which may occur on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

Simply put, when the costs, whether tolls or user fees, go up, some current business is always lost and some new business that would have been developed is not. So there is a potential double loss to the tax collector in this user fee due to these losses. The loss in production then translates into the loss of jobs for our binational region.

I cannot find anyone who has anything good to say about this Bill. The Economic Development Corporation of the St. Lawrence has also expressed its concern about the negative impact of Clause 4.

The National Farmers' Union, confronted as it is with the lowest wheat prices in 60 years, caught in the squeeze between the subsidies being paid wheat farmers in the United States and the subsidies being paid by the EEC, has had to rouse itself from the miserable battle for survival, which it is fighting with the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board (Mr. Mayer) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise), to make a comment on Clause 4 of Bill C-75. Hon. Members will appreciate that most farmers' produce gets transported to market by ship and that anything that impacts on the cost of transporting by ship impacts on farmers' profits. What did the National Farmers' Union say? It said the following:

In its preoccupation to trim the federal deficit, the Government is in effect telling farmers through this Bill that the national interest can best be served by still further increasing farm costs at a time when farmers are in very serious straits.

Let me repeat that because it bears repeating. This is what the farmers of Canada believe is the message they are receiving from the Government of Canada because of its callous introduction of Clause 4 in Bill C-75:

In its preoccupation to trim the federal deficit, the Government is in effect telling farmers through this Bill that the national interest can best be served by still further increasing farm costs at a time when farmers are in very serious financial straits.

Mr. Gauthier: Can you make photocopies of that?