

*Canada Shipping Act*

Lawrence Seaway. We have not had any information which tells us the St. Lawrence Seaway is subsidized to a greater per cent than other forms of transportation networks. We have not seen anything to indicate that there will be, as a result of this legislation, any form of mode neutrality in the allocation of transport infrastructural subsidies. We have not seen any cost benefit analysis of raising the tariffs and fees by 10 per cent, 15 per cent or 25 per cent or whatever the Government has in mind. We do not know what the Government has in mind and, indeed, it seems to me that the Government does not know what the Government has in mind.

We have not seen any economic modelling to show what will happen to the transportation flows of bulk commodities if these costs are imposed on the Seaway. There are sophisticated tools which are available to the Government. There are people who are expert in the use and application of these tools, but we have not seen anything to suggest that the Government has applied these tools to any form of analysis of the sort of charges which could be envisaged under the Act.

Every ledger, after all, Mr. Speaker, has two sides. The Government is looking at the imposition of charges and we have not been presented with any information as to how the increase of those charges might affect revenues. We also have not been given any indication as to what the Government plans to do with the \$30 million it lifted. We have had no indication as to whether it is being used to reduce taxes which, of course, was something the Budget did for those of us who have the good fortune to be wealthy. We have no indication as to whether it was applied to reduce the deficit or put into a policy reserve to be used for such purposes as the bank bail-out which is going to cost so much to Canadian taxpayers and which is going to have such a harmful effect on job creation in this country from coast to coast. We have no indication as to what the Government plans to do with the money either definitely taken or notionally generated.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the powers which this legislation allows the Government are the sort of powers which Government policy makers love to have. Government policy makers love to have the sort of flexibility, as they term it—that sweet and innocuous word—so they might be able to impose the charges where and when they felt was appropriate.

There was a statement made by an aide to the Minister of Transport who said, “We are going to make Crown corporations stand on their own two feet”. That sort of imagery and language, Mr. Speaker, surely is both outdated and inappropriate in terms of a national utility like the St. Lawrence Seaway. It is not a question of making Crown corporations stand on their own two feet. It is surely more a question of giving Crown corporations the legislative and regulatory environment, the framework and the regulations which can enable them to make intelligent and economical decisions in the national interests. That would give them the opportunity to stand on their own two feet which this legislation manifestly does not do.

Heaven only knows how the Government is going to track who uses navigational aids and to what degree. These services are as fundamental to the operation of the maritime transportation network as the salting, ploughing, and repairing of roads is to our highway network. Let the Government not be seen to be taking steps which are going to unfairly penalize one mode of transportation with economic consequences which will result in dislocation, unemployment and a great reduction in the utilization of that national utility, the St. Lawrence Seaway system.

• (1610)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 46, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)—Public Service—(a) Career planning for employees facing lay-offs. (b) Job security; the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Social security—Request for clarification of child tax credit.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### CANADA SHIPPING ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-75, an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, the Maritime Code Act and the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the amendment of Mr. Henderson (p. 7687).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Questions or comments.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member believes that users should pay some portion of the cost of a transportation service? If so, does he have any figures in mind?

**Mr. Parry:** Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to believe that the Minister of Transport believes he can find a Member in this Chamber who does not believe that users should pay some portion of the cost of the transportation system. The answer to his question is, of course, yes. The answer to his second question is that I did not have a specific figure in mind. My