

*Canada Shipping Act*

possibility of betraying this part of the union agreement is a major one which should be clarified as soon as possible.

● (1620)

I also think it is important that the Minister consider the remarks made by my hon. friend from Davenport (Mr. Caccia), who mentioned quite a number of concerns shared by those who are concerned about environmental protection in Canada. I think we must ensure that the environment is protected, especially in the remote areas of Canada's North. Our country, and we cannot say it often enough, borders not only on the Pacific and the Atlantic but also on the Arctic Ocean. Clearly, since navigation in Canada's North is becoming increasingly important, we must ensure that every possible precaution is taken to prevent ecological and environmental disasters.

I think that my colleague from the Maritimes, the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker), spoke very eloquently about the difficulties facing the marine industry and its ever growing responsibility for an ever larger share of the operating costs. My colleague from Gander-Twillingate explained in no uncertain terms that, at the very moment the industry is in the doldrums, the Conservative Government is just about to charge for services which might be provided by the Department of Transport and levy fees whose impact might be serious enough to push the industry into bankruptcy. As my colleague from Gander-Twillingate pointed out, this is hardly the time to levy an additional surtax on an industry which is already in a bind.

I am therefore in favour of the six-month hoist motion with respect to this Bill, just so the Minister will have time to reconsider the issue and enlighten us on the dire consequences the adoption of this measure might have on the Maritimes.

I would suggest there is another factor which we ought to take into consideration and which I think would justify the six-month hoist. All Hon. Members know that as a result of an investigation on the tragic *Ocean Ranger* incident, a commission of inquiry has examined the consequences of this tragedy and made a number of recommendations. The recommendations were made public last July. By mid-summer the Minister and his officials had been made aware of those recommendations.

Here we are, in early October, some three months later, and the Minister has just introduced this very important measure. Just by looking at the thickness of Bill C-75 one can readily see that it has to be an important measure. It amends the Canada Shipping Act as well as the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, the Maritime Code Act, and the Gas Production and Conservation Act. Now I think we could justifiably expect the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) to implement with that Bill the recommendations put forth as a result of the *Ocean Ranger* tragedy.

Indeed, my colleague from Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe has said how sorry he was that the main recommendation put forth by that board of inquiry was not to be found in the Bill, namely that the provisions of the Canada Shipping Act be amended so that they apply to drilling rigs located more than 200 miles offshore. The Minister has told us of course that he will come back in a few months with further amendments to the legislation which would take into account the entire recommendations made by the board.

I also take to witness the transport Minister's colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), another representative from Newfoundland, who intervened in that debate to say that he wanted to assure the people of Newfoundland that the recommendations put forth in connection with the *Ocean Ranger* would be implemented, that as a Minister in the cabinet and a representative of Newfoundland, he would see that all those recommendations are approved. He recalled that the board of inquiry chaired by Chief Justice Hickman of Newfoundland had submitted its final report which several departments, among them the Department of Transport, were now considering, in order to decide how many would be implemented. The Minister of Justice stated in concluding that as a representative of Newfoundland, the matter was of great interest to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Justice is right. The report of Mr. Justice Hickman is very important and should be the subject matter of Bill C-75. That is why the proposal made by my colleague from Egmont (Mr. Henderson) to defer for six months the discussion of this legislation is quite relevant. It would allow the Minister and his Cabinet colleagues to study in depth all the recommendations of the Hickman Report, and to come back with a comprehensive legislation that would deal with all the items that should be examined and considered by the Government concerning such a tragedy that should not be allowed to repeat itself. I think that Members on both sides of the House will agree with me that that kind of tragedy should not be allowed to recur, and the Government has a responsibility to take, within the shortest time frame possible, the steps needed to prevent such future tragedies.

I would like briefly to recall that my colleagues from the Maritimes are especially concerned with the impact of the legislation on their constituents. What is of particular concern to them is Clause 4. If you will allow me to quote one paragraph from Clause 4, I think you will understand how important it would be for the Minister to take another six months to review its terms. Clause 4 gives the Government authority to impose charges relating to navigational services upon any users of aids to navigation, dredging, vessel traffic services, ice breaking services and escorting services.

But where I do not understand the implications of the legislation, is this: if the Government wants to collect money from those who use such services, that is a decision it can take and for which it can endorse full responsibility.