

*The Address—Mr. Green*

the world enters China, and it is of the utmost importance to Canada that Hong Kong remain intact in British hands. Should Hong Kong be taken over by the communists the results for Canada would be very serious. We certainly have a stake in the protection of Hong Kong. That was put clearly by the *Vancouver Sun* in an editorial on August 17, just a little over a month ago. It is headed, "Hong Kong Emergency." The final paragraph of the editorial reads:

As for Canada, the loss of Hong Kong by the British might not be of immediate moment so far as defence is concerned but Canada is a Pacific country, as we on the west coast are well aware—and as we were painfully aware after Pearl Harbor. Ultimately we, too, are concerned with the unchecked expansion of soviet power in the regions across the Pacific bowl.

That brings me to the next question which is of concern to us on the Pacific coast. We believe that there should be a Pacific pact similar to the North Atlantic treaty, a pact designed to hold communism in the Pacific. The president of the Philippine republic spoke to the United States senate about six weeks ago. In the course of advocating some such pact he used these words:

Asia, with more than half the population of the world, and with "incalculable resources," must not be lost to communism by default.

Not only are the Philippines anxious for the pact but also Korea, Australia and New Zealand. I believe that the Canadian government should take a stand in favour of a Pacific pact before it is too late. I hope that some such step will be taken by the government.

A third subject about which we are concerned is that of shipbuilding and shipping. During the war we built a great many merchant ships, more than any other part of Canada. We also built many naval vessels, but since the war the Canadian shipbuilding industry has been gradually fading away. On our coast the work now is largely repair work. There is some naval construction promised and for that we are grateful. No attempt has yet been made to build fast cargo vessels. Canada still has many of the old slow vessels which were built during the war, but they are quite unable to compete with the fast modern vessels being built by other countries. Unless some building program is started, and started very quickly, I am afraid that the Canadian merchant marine will be a thing of the past, and that would be a tragedy for a country which has such a long maritime history as Canada, and a country to which the exporting of goods is so important.

The devaluations which have taken place during the last few days are going to make it much more difficult for the Canadian merchant marine to carry on, just that much harder for them to compete with the ships

[Mr. Green.]

of Britain, Norway, Sweden and all other countries who have devalued to a greater degree than we have. There is an announcement in the speech from the throne that some measure is to be brought in to aid shipbuilding and shipping. It should have been taken this spring when a similar promise was made in the speech from the throne. The Canadian maritime commission, set up two years ago, was supposed to give a lead in working out these policies, although personally I think the obligation has always rested and still rests with the government rather than with the commission. I do hope that at this session the government will announce a definite and broad policy for promoting shipbuilding and shipping in Canada.

Another word about shipping; I have been appalled by the disaster in Toronto. It is almost unbelievable that in 1949 a great passenger vessel lying in a berth in a port, the second largest city in Canada, could be destroyed with a loss of over a hundred lives. I think it calls for drastic action. If the regulations under the Canada Shipping Act are proper regulations then somebody has been criminally negligent and should be prosecuted. On the other hand, if the regulations are not sufficient, and I suspect that that is the position, then it is the responsibility of parliament to see that proper regulations are enacted at this very session, because Canada cannot afford to have another disaster such as the burning of the *Noronic*.

The responsibility for safety at sea rests with the Canadian parliament, certainly with the Canadian government. We have had the same problem in a smaller degree on the west coast. There an attempt has been made to whittle down expenditures a bit, and to save a little money, by taking radio operators off full-time and letting them act as freight clerks, or do some other odd jobs. They are taken away from their apparatus, just on the chance that nothing is going to happen. That has been protested against in the house by other members from British Columbia. It serves to illustrate just how careful we must be all the time to see that we have proper safety regulations, and then that those regulations are enforced.

We believe that on each coast there should be a Canadian coastguard. May I suggest to the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) that it is humiliating when, time after time, with vessels in distress along our coasts, the United States coastguard service has to come to their rescue. Just on August 17 last a Vancouver press dispatch stated:

Fishermen protest rescue by U.S. Declare navy vessel, not U.S. coastguard, should have saved the B.C. ship.