

*Government Orders*

Although 99 per cent of our coasting trade is performed by Canadian ships and this bill intends to further protect our industry, I do have a number of concerns in a number of areas which I would like to touch upon quite briefly in the time allotted to me.

First, I would like to raise the safety provisions that foreign ships operating in our coasting trade are subject to. I believe that they should be liable to meet every stringent safety standard that our Canadian vessels must comply with. Our safety standards are tougher than those of many countries, especially the United States, and therefore they cost our vessels that much more.

As well, Canadian passengers on cruise ships would like to be assured that regardless of who transports them they will be guaranteed the same safety standards from any company incorporated on any side of our border.

Clause 4 requires that following:

- (e) all foreign ship meets all safety and pollution prevention requirements imposed by any law of Canada applicable to that foreign ship.

But what about any inequities between the laws applicable to Canadian ships and those applied to foreign ships? Will we suffer in terms of safety and of pollution prevention measures because foreign ships do not have to meet the laws imposed on Canadian ships?

We all know that Canadian ships must meet Canadian standards. Of course Canadian owned ships operating in Canadian waters must meet stringent Canadian standards, but what about those foreign ships who apply for waiver? Will they have to meet the same provisions as our Canadian vessels?

Will provisions relating to crew members aboard a foreign passenger vessel be universally applied? Will there be an equal number of masters, deckhands and an engineer on board in Canadian waters regardless of whether the ship is Canadian or whether it is foreign?

I am positive that Canadians do not want us to reduce our standards, nor to increase our danger upon boarding a foreign vessel. These provisions are of concern to many Canadian shippers, whether they operate on rivers in the Thousand Islands region, the Great Lakes or on the east or west coast.

In terms of residency, clause 2 on page 3 of the bill relates to the definition of a "resident". It defines "resident" as someone who has been in Canada for six months and a day, as mentioned in the Income Tax Act.

Some observers have expressed concern over any fly-by-night shipping operation. That is to say, will they cut corners at the expense of Canadians just to make a dollar? Therefore the question is: What is the level of that commitment? In terms of ownership, what about the ownership provisions in this bill? As we know in the airline industry, a Canadian airline must be 75 per cent owned by Canadians.

We would support a similar amendment to the Canadian Shipping Act that would introduce a provision that would perhaps be along similar lines where it is not now mentioned.

What about the provisions of the coasting trade bill to allow American ships to transport goods to Canadian Distant Early Warning Line sites? What about Canadian shipping opportunities in that area? Again, there have been concerns raised by a number of observers whether we should, above all, be transporting goods to our own DEW Line sites.

Finally, clause 8 on page 7 states:

- (2) The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the criteria to be applied by the Agency in making the determinations referred to in subsection (1).

Does this mean that a *carte blanche* is given to the government in determining licence for foreign ships, or should this in fact be protected and based in legislation?

We opt for the latter because it is a greater insurance that in fact the government of the day will certainly not be able to make an Order in Council that may be against the national interests of the time.

I believe that the minister and the government must come clean and explain some of these provisions during the second reading phase and clearly in committee stage. Though the government may claim that this bill is its version of the American Jones Act, it does not even come close to the restrictive and prohibitory measures that the American shipping interests enjoy south of the border.