

*Canada Shipping Act*

been no prior consultation with the shipping community or the business community in order to assess the economic and other impacts of the Bill. It is surprising that on every other aspect of Bill C-75, there has been extensive consultation with industry, but on Section 4, there has been no consultation whatsoever.

This is the brand new day the Prime Minister promised all of Canada. This is the brand new era. This is the day of consultation when we shall put an end to confrontation. Well, the Prime Minister was half right. There is no confrontation on Clause 4 because he did not tell anyone about it. He tried to sneak it in through the back door. He tried to slip it in at the last minute, have it passed and have people find out about it later. So, he is right. There is no confrontation because he simply does not tell people everything they should know and everything they want to know. It is like sneaking up behind a fellow with a baseball bat and hitting him over the head. It is a way of avoiding picking a fight. One just slugs him when he does not see it coming. That way one can never lay the claim that one did not consult him before one hit him. In fact, he will never know what hit him.

● (1450)

That is what the Government of Canada is attempting to do to the shipping industry of this country. That is what it is attempting to do to the Montreal Board of Trade and to the fishermen on Cape St. George who are sitting on their pots pondering the horizon and their futures in the face of this regressive legislation. That is what it is attempting to do to the forestry workers overlooking the shores of Vancouver harbour and to the farmers who are sitting on the Prairies battling the grasshoppers. That is what the Government is doing. It is sneaking up behind these people with a two-by-four. When their backs are turned, a mighty arc of the arm will come down crushing forever their hopes of remaining economically viable.

The Prime Minister should recall his own words. Several times he has stood in his place in this House and said: "You can blind-side me once, but don't try it a second time". I am here to advise the Prime Minister that he can attempt to blind-side the people of Canada once, but it will not work a second time. The Government should not expect to be surrounded by a swarm of applauding hands that applaud at every utterance the Prime Minister makes in the House of Commons when this type of legislation, notwithstanding the concerns of Canadians, is still before the House. The Prime Minister ought not to mistake the applause of his 211 Members for the approval of the people of Canada. While the applause is loud and even thunderous on some days in this place, out there in the land there is no applause. There is the dead cold silence that comes with the realization that the commitments that were made in the summer of 1984 were no more than that—passing, momentary, whimsical comments designed to attract a handful of votes for a point in time, but never intended as a road-map for an administration that would keep its word. The people of Canada have sobered up.

What do members of the Canadian Merchant Service Guild have to say about Bill C-75? It is a guild of a few words. They say that they are against Clause 4. In the end their concern is the loss of jobs. Canada Steamship Limited, a large Canadian shipping company, has this to say about Bill C-75 in Clause 4. It states that the Canadian shipping industry has carefully honed its competitive edge through continuous innovation and productivity and that additional costs will dull that edge, harming the shipping industry and many other important Canadian industries, including agriculture. It says that Clause 4 could attempt to achieve a system of cost recovery whereby the high operating budget of the Canadian Coast Guard may be recovered primarily from the Canadian shipping industry, which can ill afford additional charges at this time. Ultramar is opposed to Clause 4. The Petroleum Association for the Conservation of the Environment has trouble with the non-representative nature of the charges to be imposed as a result of Clause 4. The Canadian Shippers' Council states that user fees for Coast Guard services could result in some cargo being diverted through the U.S. transportation system and through U.S. ports. The Canadian Pulp and Paper Association says that its base business is export and cost increases can only reduce the very business that Government is trying to help.

For those who are living in the cities of this country who wonder whether or not they will be impacted by this Bill, and for all of you who live in the land of textile and high technology and go to work in the factories, I want to relate what the Canadian Manufacturers Association has stated. It has said that the enabling legislation on Coast Guard cost recovery is too open-ended and arbitrary. It states that there has been no shipper input, that little information has been received from Government and that there has been no indication of improved efficiency as an objective. It questions whether a public service such as the Coast Guard should be handled in this manner.

Even the Canadian Amateur Rowing Association is opposed to this clause. Can Hon. Members imagine an organization that does not even have a diesel or a gasoline engine behind it when it goes out on the water being opposed to this Bill? Its position is that the user fee for Coast Guard services should not be applied to Canadian rowing simply because rowing does not use the services of the Coast Guard. What type of legislation is this when those people who belong to an association, which allows them to go out on a Sunday afternoon with their wives in the front of the boat and Johnny and Annie in the middle of the boat, with a canteen with a bit of Kool-Aid and a few sandwiches, have to take the trouble to come before a legislative committee and point out that they, too, are concerned about the impact of Clause 4? Can Hon. Members imagine the fellow, who has a dory tucked away in his garage in the winter months and takes it out for a row around the lake on Sunday with his wife or girlfriend in tow, has to take the trouble to appear before a legislative committee to oppose Clause 4? The fellow with his row-boat, his two oars, no engine and a jug of wine, if it is a romantic trip, has discovered that he may be the victim of Coast Guard charges in the lusty pursuit of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) to balance the