

Canada Shipping Act

it is doing something about employment equity for four target groups—natives, disabled persons, women, and visible minorities. However, each of those target groups has appeared before the committee and has said: "We would rather have nothing at all than have Bill C-62". Why should legislation be introduced which is purported to be advancing the causes of those four target groups when those groups are saying that it is simply a sham? Here again we have the same philosophy.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I draw to your attention the fact that we are debating Bill C-75, an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act, not Bill C-62 which in fact has been passed into law. I ask the Hon. Member to make sure that his remarks remain relevant.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on that point of order. If the Hon. Member who just rose had paid attention to the debate and had followed the history of the Bill, he would know that my colleague is speaking on Bill C-75 for the second time. He would also know that my colleague is very much interested in it and has been very well briefed. Bill C-62 is not on our minds in the slightest. The Hon. Member has raised a nefarious and time-wasting point of order in the middle of my colleague's contribution to the debate on this nonsensical, cruel, harsh, and inhumane piece of legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could we please return to debate.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Hon. Member did not listen to my point of order. I referred to the need for relevancy in this debate. We are dealing with Bill C-75, not with the employment equity Act which has now been passed into law. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the Hon. Member maintains relevance in this debate and directs his remarks strictly to Bill C-75.

Mr. Nunziata: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) seeking the floor on the same point of order? If it is just the matter of relevancy, could we please give the floor to the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi)?

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on a separate point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am trying to get rid of the point of order dealing with relevance. The Hon. Member is seeking the floor on a separate point of order.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) is not sitting in his seat. It is my understanding that he sits to our right, and he is sitting to our far left now. Could I have some direction from the Chair on whether his permanent place in the House has been moved to the left?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not know if the Hon. Member has moved to the left, but in fact there have been changes in the seating arrangements on the government side. The Hon.

Member for York East (Mr. Redway) is in fact sitting in his correct seat. We will return to debate with the Hon. Member for York West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Because I believe that the Government is trying to talk out this Bill and is trying to waste the time of the House, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule more quickly on nefarious points of order, not allow Hon. Members to carry on and on with nefarious points of order and waste the time of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for York West on debate, with two minutes remaining.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I hope the non-point of order raised by the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) will not be deducted from my time. It is obvious from the tenor of the reaction which we solicit on the Government side that we are lifting a very sensitive nerve. It was correct that I raised Bill C-62 in connection with this Bill. It was perfectly in order because it depicted very clearly the malaise which has beset the Government and will certainly be eradicated in the next election. There is a difference between what it purports to do and what the legislation will actually do. Government Members cannot sit on both sides of the fence. They cannot simply say that they are in favour of helping fishing communities in this case and then live with Bill C-75 and its Clause 4.

Mr. Forrestall: Sit down.

Mr. Marchi: That clause imposes user fees for safety, navigation and ice-breaking.

Mr. Forrestall: You are filibustering.

Mr. Marchi: If the Parliamentary Secretary wishes to add his two cents to this debate, let him have the courage to stand on his feet. Let him have the conviction to rise in his place where careers are made and broken. Let him defend those communities of which he is a part rather than defend the indefensible—his Minister. He should not act in the same way as other Parliamentary Secretaries or lackeys who rise in their places and support something which they know is incorrect and wrong. If he has a genuine interest in the communities which will be directly affected, if he is interested in the representations the organizations are making and will continue to make, he should follow his conscience and his gut feelings by rising in his place and using any suasion he may have with the Minister in an attempt to bring some sensitivity, fairness and justice into the matter.

The clauses in Bill C-75—and we are flagging Clause No. 4—are insensitive and play into the hands of departmental officials rather than admit what the country is about. The country is about more than Ontario and Quebec. It is about regions and communities in our hinterlands. It is about regional development. It is about trying to make everyone an equal partner in the country regardless of where a region is