

Canada Shipping Act

either fully or partially implemented. The remaining 20 per cent require legislative authority to implement. That is what this process is all about. The recommendations contained in the more detailed report, some three volumes, require legislative change or Government-industry agreement after very close consultation.

The Hon. Member and others have said that this Bill does not address the *Ocean Ranger* report. In Bill C-75 we are dealing with safety at sea, standards of training and certification of seafarers, and we are dealing with greater capacity for the Board of Steamship Inspections to assure themselves and the Canadian public of the safety of the rigs. We deal with construction and equipment. We require the implementation of certain conventions and codes, some of which have been hanging around since 1969. That is about 15 or 16 years ago. For the edification of the House, these include the 1969 International Convention on Tonnage and Measurement of Ships. The International Convention on Standards of Training, the certification of watchkeeping certificate for seafarers; and the 1978 protocol to the 1974 International Convention of Safety of Life at Sea. Then we have the 1975 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution and the 1958 Seafarers' Identity Document Convention. We have also included the 1969 International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage and the 1971 International Convention on the Establishment of the Fund for Compensation of Oil Pollution Damage. Among the codes that are even more pertinent are the code for the construction of equipment of ships carrying liquefied gases in bulk, the code for existing ships carrying liquefied gases other than in bulk, the code for the construction and equipment of ships carrying dangerous chemicals, and the code for the construction and equipment of mobile off-shore drilling units, the very thing which must be ratified before Canada can implement the regulations.

● (1630)

I ask the Hon. Member where in this Bill, if he has read it, he got the impression that Bill C-75 is not attempting to address the very real concerns which he raised, almost blatantly, and, I suggest, with perhaps not as much regard as he should have for the families of those who have been lost.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the last words of the Member opposite. I hope he will stand in his place and apologize for them.

Mr. Forrestall: Oh, come on.

Mr. Tobin: I am serious. I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks that no Member of this House had a monopoly on concern for people off-shore. I have stated repeatedly—and I wish the Member would read the “blues”—that every Member has a concern—

Mr. Forrestall: Stop trading on their misfortune.

Mr. Tobin: I have to tell you, sir—

Mr. Forrestall: You are trading on their misfortune and you should be ashamed.

Mr. Tobin: The comments that the Hon. Member has just made are not worthy of his responsibility as a Member of Parliament and are certainly not worthy of his responsibility as a Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. I will also say that they are not worthy of an honourable man. I will say no more, Mr. Speaker. When I speak in this House on the *Ocean Ranger* and the *Ocean Ranger* disaster, I speak as a Member of Parliament from Newfoundland who is concerned about all 84 people who went down on that rig. There were two people from my riding who went down on that rig and I do not want my sincerity questioned by any Member.

Mr. Forrestall: You are trading on it and you know it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. I appreciate the comments being made and the exchange which is taking place. We are touching on a very serious incident which happened and I hope that Hon. Members on both sides will cool it, shall I say, and let us get on with the debate.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, if this is not the place to talk about it, I don't know what is. The Hon. Member says that 80 per cent of the recommendations have been implemented or partially implemented. I congratulate the Government, as I have in the past, for implementing those recommendations which it has. However, some of the so-called partially implemented recommendations are very much partial. The Government says that it has met a recommendation that a helicopter base be established in St. John's by temporarily stationing a helicopter from time to time in St. John's. That is not the recommendation of the commission on the *Ocean Ranger*. That recommendation has not been met as the Government claims it has.

I would like to see a report card from the royal commission which would tell us how many of these so-called recommendations the Government believes it has met have indeed been met, in the minds of the *Ocean Ranger* commissioners. The commission said that there ought to be a full-time helicopter facility established in St. John's. The Government says that it has met that recommendation by moving a helicopter from Gander into St. John's from time to time. That is not meeting the recommendation of the royal commission. The Parliamentary Secretary, the Minister, and the Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) know that. The Member is very knowledgeable about this matter. He knows that everyone in Newfoundland knows it.

People are questioning the very nature and type of the helicopter which is currently being used. People are questioning whether this vehicle is proper and sufficient for use in off-shore weather and icing conditions. We are still using those same helicopters with no publicly expressed intention to replace them with more modern and efficient aircraft. That indicates that the spirit of the recommendations are not being met. The means for getting off the rig when it is listing or in a stormy sea is a couple of slings which drop a capsule over the side. That is the same means which was in place on February