

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. I suggest we debate both motions and vote upon them separately. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Thank you for restoring some order to the proceedings, Mr. Speaker.

We will deal first with the absence from the bill of a procedure by which an affected person could make his views known to the Canadian Transport Commission where a permit or licence had been granted. I am not sure whether it was an oversight in the bill. In committee I had intended to introduce it as part of a larger amendment dealing with publication of notice by an applicant seeking a permit or licence to operate in Canadian waters under the terms of the proposed Maritime Code. In my concern to make sure the notices were published in the two languages in the official *Gazettes* of Canada and the provinces and so on, I drafted but neglected to instruct my secretary with respect to this particular amendment.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is very important in the context of the practice in recent years. A lot of people view the practice of the Canadian Transport Commission in issuing special permits and licence as a rubber-stamp operation—a buddy system. Somebody wants to charter to move potatoes to the Caribbean and says "I have such and such a motor vessel. I will fix it here and be in Halifax on such and such a date. How about it? How are you Dave? How's the wife and kids?" And that is the end of it.

It is a rubberstamp operation and always has been. The practice is likely to continue, and there have been many instances of it in recent years. There is the matter of the seismographic work in the north in connection with the search for oil. The government chartered an offshore ship while there was a Canadian ship that could do the job. The owner of the ship had no recourse except to go to the newspapers and make a noise, or go to his member of parliament. None of the remedies were satisfactory and he had no appeal, nowhere to turn.

My amendment proposes that:

Any person having an interest therein may make oral or written representations to the Canadian Transport Commission in respect of the issuance, suspension, cancellation or renewal of a licence applied for or issued under this section.

What that does is make it possible, where the owner of a Canadian vessel finds his vessel lying idle while a foreign owned vessel is working in Canadian waters, for the Canadian owner to state his case to the Canadian Transport Commission. It would then act according to the degree the affected person was able to demonstrate injury.

When I introduced this amendment earlier I introduced with it a substantially longer amendment which called for a procedure by which the public would be notified that a special permit or licence was being sought by a particular operator. The notice was to be published where the shipping community would normally expect to see it. In other words, people would not have to buy the Vancouver newspapers to find out whether a ship was coming here under special licence. That required four weeks' notice and was not accepted because it was felt to be unduly restrictive. I

### *Maritime Code*

accept that, as I accept the admonition of the council of maritime premiers that we must be careful not to interfere with the need to move quickly in some instances. This is simply a procedure by which somebody who feels the commission has gone outside the terms of the statute can appeal his case and tell his story.

I have not heard the view of the parliamentary secretary with respect to this rather simple amendment but I would appreciate hearing his comments. I see the parliamentary secretary busy with a pencil. I hope that is an indication the government will accept our suggestions. It is important to have these matters spelled out clearly in statute form.

● (1510)

Next I shall speak of something fundamental to our Canadian way of life. It is basic to our sense of propriety, of fairness to those who work for us, and to our sense of dignity. I should like to see foreign registered vessels, operating in Canada under special licence for one or more permit periods, come under Canadian law totally. I am not talking of the vessel which you charter quickly to move one cargo of grain from Saint John to the Lakehead. No, I am talking of specialized ships which operate in Canada for prolonged periods. We should require such ships to comply with the Canadian Maritime Code and with all Canadian law.

It is grossly unfair to our own shippers and our own sailors to allow foreign ships working in Canada to comply with standards completely different from those we impose on our Canadian seamen. It is only fair to require foreign crews working in Canada for extended periods to comply with all aspects of Canadian law. They should comply with the labour code, the Immigration Act, and other laws. While here they should assume the status of landed immigrants. If they refuse we should hire Canadian seamen to work on those ships.

It is a myth to suggest that Canadian crews are not available. We have all kinds of seamen available in this country. The ships should be covered by the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act. We do not want foreign seamen in this country to work under conditions worse than those which we accept as decent for our own seamen. When I make these remarks I think of ships like the *Traveltol*, and the ro-ro—roll on, roll off—ships which operate out of Saint John, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Halifax, and carry cars and other vehicles. They are specialized ships and operate here for extended periods with foreign crews. At present I do not think those crews come under Canadian law. That is not fair. It is wrong. Either our laws apply to all who work in Canada, or they do not.

No person should be entitled to work in this country unless he conforms to the Canada Labour Code. We do not allow people in this country unless they meet the conditions of the Immigration Act. Why allow them to work here if they do not meet the conditions of the labour code? Apparently seamen are the exception. That is not right and I suggest is not what parliament intended.

We shall be more humane, show more concern, and be more highly respected if we ensure that all foreigners who work in Canada are protected by and conform to Canadian law and enjoy the benefits and protection of that law. I commend this course to the House. I hope my colleagues