

Canada Shipping Act

15, 1982. That indicates that the spirit of the recommendations have not been met.

That is all I am saying, Mr. Speaker. It has nothing to do with partisan politics. It has to do with doing the best we can by using the technology that is available in this country and the money that is available to the Government to make the best possible system. I have said that no system can guarantee the safety of anyone on a rig but, by God, we should do our best. If the Parliamentary Secretary wants to call into question anyone's sincerity in raising this matter in the House, then he is out of touch. I give him the opportunity to apologize for that comment. I would not accuse any Member—

Mr. Forrestall: You just did.

Mr. Tobin: I would not accuse any Member—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please.

Mr. Tobin: —in a natural disaster of this kind—

Mr. Forrestall: You're trading on the misery of those families and you know it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The period for questions and comments is now terminated. I would like to recognize the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie).

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I was not planning to get involved in this particular debate, but since the matter of the *Ocean Ranger* has come up I thought that I would speak about it for a few moments because I am taking an obvious interest in ensuring that the recommendations with regard to the *Ocean Ranger* are implemented in so far as they can be. The final report of the commission on the *Ocean Ranger* which was headed by Chief Justice Hickman of Newfoundland was only received in July if my memory serves me right. That report is now under intense scrutiny by various departments of the Government, including the Department of Transport, in order to decide how many of the recommendations can be effected. Since I am a Member from Newfoundland I am taking a particular interest in that period.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I met last Friday with the chairman of the committee of officials which is dealing with the report. The legislation which is now before the House deals with revisions and changes to the *Canada Shipping Act*. As we all know, it is not, nor will it be, the only legislation which applies to Canada's off-shore areas. I would like to assure the Members of this House, and through this House anyone who might be watching or interested from Newfoundland and Labrador, that the recommendations of the *Ocean Ranger* commission are going to be implemented wherever possible and wherever the Government considers that these recommendations would bring about improvement which are possible and can reasonably be made in connection with off-shore safety of Canada. The Government will certainly make clear its position on each recommendation which it feels it cannot or should not accept and on each recommendation which will only be par-

tially accepted or partially implemented. Nothing less would be satisfactory.

I am pleased that the hon. gentleman has brought up this subject as it is a most important one. I know that some of his rhetoric is just that. He likes to expound with some vigour and as a young MP he is coming along. He is certainly able to fill this Chamber with the rotundities of his views, if that is the right wording.

Mr. Nystrom: The new John Crosbie.

Mr. Crosbie: Being in Opposition, he can now do that and exercise himself with considerable indignation whereas in former times he had to remain silent. One can understand that he is somewhat like the steam kettle that has been on the boil all day with a wooden plug in the bung-hole. Having come from Government and into Opposition of course the bung-hole has sprung and all the steam is pushing out. We welcome it. Of course, often the hon. gentleman does not make more sense than a bung-hole.

● (1640)

Mr. Nystrom: What hole?

Mr. Crosbie: Bung-hole. It is a kind of hole that you would not understand, coming from Saskatchewan.

Returning to the point, I would ask the hon. gentleman to remember that when the *Ocean Ranger* tragedy occurred in 1982, it occurred when our predecessor Government had been in power for some 20 years. It is obvious from the circumstances that surrounded that incident, certainly as later found by the royal commission, that some peculiar situations had been allowed to develop about which people had not been made aware. Most of this has been clearly pointed out in the report of the *Ocean Ranger*. Hopefully it is not a situation that will ever occur again but we have to be vigilant to make sure that it does not occur again.

The *Ocean Ranger* commission consisted of six members. As I recall, three were nominated by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and three were nominated by the Government of Canada. Both Governments jointly shared the expenses of that commission. However, this is primarily within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada and it has a responsibility to see that these recommendations are carried out except where a conclusion is reached that a recommendation is not the right one.

In addition to the fact that the legislation and regulations that pertained in 1982, at the time of this occurrence, were regulations that were implemented under a legislative regime for which the hon. gentlemen opposite had been responsible for some 20 years, I would point out that there have been considerable improvements brought about in the situation since this Government assumed office. The Hon. Member mentioned one of those improvements but only did so to denigrate it. It is the stationing of National Defence search and rescue helicopters in St. John's during the winter period, which is the period of