

*Canada Shipping Act*

**Mr. Forrestall:** It doesn't require it.

**Mr. Cassidy:** The Hon. Member says it does not require it but the Hon. Member should know perfectly well—and I hope he rises during the opportunity for comments—that we are giving an open door to the ministry to apply these charges. What about a port on which a fish packing plant in a small Gaspé village depended? It could cost \$100,000 a year, according to the Ministry's allocation of costs, to send ice-breakers up and down the coast of that village in the winter-time. It could happen that boats never come into the village and the winter-time but they would during the spring, the summer and the fall. They would nevertheless be charged an allocated cost for ice-breaking service which they never used, which is permitted in Clause 4 as it is written here. That is why I and my Party are suggesting at the very least that that section be taken out, that the premise be referred to a standing committee of the House of Commons. We changed the rules to look at situations like that to see whether there is not a better way of accomplishing what the Government wants. Alternatively, in order to establish, as I suspect, the idea is a bum idea in the first place and it should not be proceeded with in its current form.

I would hate to see this Government go down in history as the Government that closed up ports in Newfoundland because of the full cost recovery principle, as the Government that closed down villages in the Gaspé because of the full cost recovery principle, as the Government that closed down villages, ports and services in the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) riding of Manicouagan because of the full cost recovery principle. That is what is under-way right here, Mr. Speaker.

My colleagues have pointed out the very substantial link—

**Mr. Forrestall:** It is your imagination.

**Mr. Cassidy:** —between the Port of Thunder Bay and the grain elevators in the Prime Minister's riding of Manicouagan. They have pointed out that the full cost recovery principle, which jeopardizes grain shipments and jobs in Thunder Bay also jeopardizes jobs in the Prime Minister's riding. Everybody knows there are not enough jobs to go around in that area because of the number of other industries which the Prime Minister himself has shut down or have been shut down since he went into politics on an elected basis.

Perhaps I can appeal to Government Members on the basis of "Don't do it Brian". Do not put the Prime Minister in a situation where he has to make special pleadings to the Minister of Transport in order to keep the industries in his riding from being shut down because the Minister of Transport, aided by the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion wants to apply the full cost recovery principle. Take this clause out of the Bill. Allow us to think about it separately and then the technical parts of these amendments to the Canada Shipping Act can go forward.

● (1740)

My time is almost up, but I want to make a final comment to reiterate what I said in French. The St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes are an extraordinary national asset for Canadians. They have not been seen in that way in the past. They should be in the future. It is time that the Government of Canada took the lead which has now been demonstrated by the secretariat for la mise en valeur du St-Laurent in the Province of Quebec, and looked at this resource as an opportunity, not as a problem. I regret very much that the Government is looking on navigational areas of Canada not as an opportunity but simply as a milk cow to be milked until navigation is brought to a grinding halt.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-75. I should first like to make a comment on a point which the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) already touched upon. He mentioned in his speech that the Bill does not include drilling rigs in Hibernia, in Venture or off the coasts of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. It may well be that this was not intended, and I say that understanding the particular point. It may not be that this is the place for comprehensive rules and regulations dealing with drilling rigs. However, it is a matter at which the Minister must look very soon.

Hon. Members on all sides of the House were saddened by the tragedy of the *Ocean Ranger*. Some of us realize that the recommendations of the commission were very good ones. Of course most of them cannot be implemented overnight, but we must keep in mind the importance of this particular tragedy. We must be absolutely certain that it does not happen again. I hope we will have before the House something more substantial regarding drilling rigs and safety precautions than we have seen in the past. Hopefully it will be coming very shortly.

The Hon. Member for Egmont (Mr. Henderson) moved a motion, and I must say that we agree with him. He stated his reasons, and I have reasons of great concern to me and to the area which I represent. The Minister knows my area. He is familiar with the transportation, shipping and unemployment problems of that area. I must say, in fairness to him, that he has not been unsympathetic to many of the things I discussed with him. As we are discussing the Bill and the motion of the Hon. Member for Egmont at this point in time, I should like to mention some points. Clause 4 indicates that there will be charges for aids to navigation, dredging, vessel traffic services, ice-breaking services and escort services. I will not touch that last one. The Minister can explain exactly what is meant in the Bill by "escort services". However, I feel that it will be very difficult for shippers on the Atlantic Coast to meet these charges. I do not know whether the Department has thought out exactly how it will work these charges, upon whom they will be laid or exactly where the burden will fall. As the House knows, the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada has been faced with some difficulties. The difficulty faced by the shipping industry was mentioned by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). Where will this burden fall? If it falls in the wrong way, if it falls on shippers, fishermen and people