

Maritime Code

fought long and hard for it. Although he is no longer in the partisan sphere I indicate his concern for the protection of the security of transport in the maritimes, in British Columbia and elsewhere in Canada, and his concern about anything that imperils the livelihood of the thousands of Canadians who rely on competitive transport for their survival or economic well-being.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leeway you have given me with regard to the very specific amendment the parliamentary secretary has brought in. We have no serious objection to the amendment. We merely wish to indicate in a general way our caveat or reservation concerning the general drafting of the bill. I would hope the parliamentary secretary, or the Minister of Transport personally would give this House the assurance that they are satisfied that the drafters of this bill have done a piece of work which will lead to an equitable interpretation by the courts in Canada, whether it be in English or in French.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I would be lacking in full Canadianism if I did not support the basic thrust of this bill. I have often stated, and my words on the record in this House have made abundantly clear, that in my view Canada requires its own merchant marine.

Canada is a nation which is involved in international trade. We have three coasts. Much of our trade is carried by ships. We will not be able to expand our trade until we are able to command the bottoms in which it is carried.

Basically this is a piece of legislation we have been awaiting. The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), who has just spoken, mentioned some of the shortcomings that we see in the amendment proposed by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and spoken to briefly by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale). One of the shortcomings is in respect of something that appears in the French text compared to what appears in the English text. I should like to direct attention to two portions. One immediately strikes the point.

Although I do not think one can push this too far, generally speaking there is an equivalence in the English version of the protracted text in the French version; because of the precision with which the French language defines itself the French version normally is a little longer than the English version. When I see a French version that is shorter than the English version it immediately jumps at my eye. I immediately think that something must be omitted somewhere. Then I examine it more closely. There may be other examples, but here I find at least two. This is a long complicated bill which requires a great deal of examination, even having just this in mind.

I should like to cite an example on page 14. Mr. Speaker, if you look at the top of page 14 you will see subclause (2) which is almost twice as long as the French version. One might say to oneself that the French version is concise here. However, I do not think this can be so. I looked a little more closely. I find that there is one expression in the English text which really is not carried over into the French text. One of the expressions in subclause (2) is:

... in the twelve month period immediately preceding September 24, 1973 ...

[Mr. Forrestall.]

The French version says simply:

A régulièrement et légalement fait du cabotage au Canada depuis le 24 septembre 1972.

That is a different version of the whole thing. Perhaps we should shorten up the English version to correspond with the French version. Instead of saying, "for the twelve month period immediately preceding September 24, 1973" we should say "regularly and legally having been in the service of cabotage in Canada since September 24, 1972." Perhaps this is one aspect of the free translation or free interpretation.

Another example I would cite is on page 50. Here again we have a counteraction in the French. Here the meaning of "cabotage" is narrowed much more in English than in the French. In French it is very large:

Utilisé pour faire du cabotage au Canada.

It refers to "other than a Canadian ship in the particular aspect of the coasting trade". The coasting trade, roughly speaking, one can say is cabotage. There is reference to the particular aspect of the coasting trade of Canada in which the applicant proposes to use the ship to which the application relates. I do not think "faire du cabotage" can be translated with this lengthy expression or that the lengthy English expression can be translated into French by simply saying "faire du cabotage" because cabotage does not cover a definition of a particular form of cabotage when one looks at the definition. In fact "cabotage", if we look in the definition under this bill, is not defined at all. So I support the remarks of my colleague from Dartmouth-Halifax East who mentioned this aspect of the bill. Again I agree with him generally that this is a bill that Canada has long needed.

There is another aspect of the definitions here that I feel is worthy of bringing to your attention, Mr. Speaker. That is, we have two definitions of a Canadian ship, one appearing on page 2 under the definition of Canadian ship. It is on page 2 as item 6. Then on page 4, the third full definition is that of *navire canadien*. That corresponds with item 6 of the definition in English. Having got there we see that a Canadian ship means a Canadian registered ship or a Canadian registered small craft. Then we go to page 12, and we find that "for the purposes of this section and sections 11, 12 and 14" a Canadian ship means something else.

● (2120)

Mr. Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt my hon. friend, and I say that sincerely, but I think we have had a bit of a misunderstanding as to our way of proceeding this evening. It relates to the original grouping of motions in terms of debating purposes and voting purposes for this evening's discussion. It seems that both my hon. friends across the way and I misunderstood what Madam Speaker earlier had concluded on this matter.

With the consent of the House I propose a new arrangement for dealing with the various motions on the order paper in terms of the clauses that we group together for discussion purposes. I think, just as an aside, that all of us who have spoken so far, including my hon. friend whom I have just interrupted—and I apologize for that—have restricted our remarks so far to the question of the correspondence between the English and French versions, so I