

*Canada Shipping Act*

the Government of Canada, during the course of its appearance before the royal commission, that when it next reviews the Canada Shipping Act it should include under that jurisdiction the responsibility for monitoring and regulating oil rigs at sea. That recommendation was also ignored.

During the course of my remarks concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway, I gave an assessment and profile of the organizations opposed to Clause 4, the user-pay clause. It is the guillotine clause. It is the Seaway destroying and Montreal Chamber of Commerce and Port of Montreal bashing clause. It is the fishermen bashing clause, the potato farmer bashing clause. It is a forestry worker bashing clause. It is the Quebec Metal Mining Association bashing clause. In the course of talking to ordinary Canadians, both powerful and humble, they are opposed to this piece of legislation.

● (1550)

I mentioned as well that it struck me as being rather strange that a Government that claims it can negotiate a comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States is moving unilaterally to impose user fees on the Seaway, which is jointly administered by both the Government of Canada and a U.S. appointed commission.

At that time I said that certain individuals, including U.S. Representatives and U.S. Senators, had written to the Prime Minister of Canada pointing out that after 30 years of joint management, 30 years of being able to agree on every single occasion to new rules, regulations or charges that would affect the authority, joint agreement, solidarity, harmony, happiness, blissful relationship between the American and Canadian administrations, for the first time we have Canada acting unilaterally. For the first time we have our U.S. partners moved to the embarrassing position of having to go past the Minister of Transport, to go past the good offices of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, to go past the good offices of the Canadian ambassador and to write directly to the Prime Minister of Canada asking the Government what it is doing. It takes two to manage the authority and this unilateral action the Government is taking with Clause 4 will destroy the joint nature of the management plan that has existed.

Just 24 days ago I received in my office a copy of a letter written by Mr. Donald Rothwell, President of the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association to the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) asking that the Leader of the Official Opposition contact his colleagues, the Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) and the Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe to take a second look at what it is the Government of Canada is attempting to finesse in the dying days of Parliament past the noses of parliamentarians and onto the backs of Canada's shippers.

It was a very good letter that he wrote to the Leader of the Opposition because it included some very interesting material. As well as outlining his objection to Bill C-75, Mr. Rothwell provided the Leader of the Opposition with some very interesting correspondence, including a letter to the Prime

Minister by ULS International Inc., Toronto, Ontario. The letter is written to the Prime Minister of Canada, and obviously written by someone who knows him well because it starts, "Dear Brian". It says: "I would like to draw to your attention our concern over Clause 4 of Bill C-75. In its present form the authority it provides this and future Governments to charge for Coast Guard services is virtually unconstrained. As a result, potential for economic dislocation to the detriment of the lakes, St. Lawrence traffic is open ended."

He goes on to say: "I know it is unnecessary to recite recent stats to prove that utilization by both grain and iron ore was in free fall last year, culminating a downward trend that began in 1975."

He says to "Dear Brian": "Clause 4 requires a great deal of revision before it is ready to be passed into legislation."

I think we all know the "Dear Brian" referred to, the Prime Minister, went out shortly after this letter was received, and shortly after a meeting with the Premier of Quebec, and promised to have another look at Clause 4. We all know what happened. His commitment to have another look was like so many other commitments, like snow that melts in spring, when you turn around it is gone. Bill C-75, with all of its terrible implications is still before the House.

There is another letter that I know Members would be most interested in hearing about. It is a more formal letter, more chilling.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, I guess it was two or three minutes ago, the Member referred to Crosbie Offshore. I am just wondering if he could inform the House as to whether this is the Crosbie Offshore of—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr. Tobin:** Yes, to that question which was not a point of order and which I therefore did not hear, it is one and the same family that is represented by a certain Hon. Member from St. John's West in this House. There is a second letter written to the Prime Minister. The first letter started off, "Dear Brian", it was warm, friendly, confident of being heard. The second letter is more formal, more chilling. This one is written, "Dear Mr. Prime Minister", no more "Dear Brian". It is from the Great Lakes Commission of Ann Arbor, Michigan. The Great Lakes Commission, for those who do not know, is the American institution that is the equivalent of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority. The Great Lakes Commission is the American body that does the same job and that works hand in hand with our agency to manage the St. Lawrence Seaway. In their letter they say: "The Great Lakes Commission is deeply concerned about proposed Bill C-75, which would authorize the imposition of cost recovery for Canadian Coast Guard services. The Commission respects Canada's needs to raise additional revenues. The Commission accepts Canada's choice of user fees as one vehicle to accomplish that end. However, the Commission, as the only co-ordinating and advocacy agency established by the States and approved by Congress to