

Canada Shipping Act

Bill and that is one reason the House should pass the Bill. Lo and behold, the next day, a telex was sent to the Minister of Transport regarding Bill C-75. The telex read as follows:

"It has come to my attention that in third reading debate regarding Bill C-75 on Wednesday, June 11, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth—Halifax East, Nova Scotia, and your Parliamentary Secretary said that he was "encouraged by the positive response of Canada Steamship Lines Inc. amongst others to Section 4 of Bill C-75". That is a distortion of our position that I would like to correct. In our appearance before the legislative committee on this subject, we stated that the "concept of user fees exists and is accepted in the shipping industry today". However, we went on to list a number of serious objections to Clause 4. We were and remain concerned about the open-ended nature of the Section and the lack of reasonable limitations on this new cost-recovery mandate. In addition, with declining cargoes on the Seaway and a weakened competitive position, we consider the timing of these proposed new charges to be particularly poor. Our concerns regarding Section 4 are outlined in detail in the brief which we sent to you and presented to the legislative committee. I think it would be appropriate that the Hon. Member for Dartmouth—Halifax East and your Department take a second look at that brief as well as those presented by the Dominion Marine Association, the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association and many others. It is our opinion that Section 4 of Bill C-75 will be a serious blow to the shipping industry and the industries and economies associated with it. Any other statement is a misrepresentation of CSL's position.

It is indeed a strange day when major Canadian shipping organizations and companies find it necessary to send a telex to every single Member of Parliament and Senator to indicate that their positions have been misrepresented by a representative of the Government in seeking support of Members of Parliament for this ill-conceived Bill C-75.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) has been referring to a certain telex that was sent to Members of Parliament. I seek direction from Your Honour on whether it would be appropriate at this point to request that the document, to which the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) referred, be tabled in the House to enable all Canadians—

• (1640)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. Neither the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) nor the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) have the right to table such a document.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, are you suggesting that we table the document or not?

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member is well aware that he cannot table it, no matter what the Chair or he might want.

Mrs. Finestone: On a point of information, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing called a point of information in this House. There is in some other Houses but not in this one.

Mrs. Finestone: I was wondering whether we could have it appended to *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have been very clear in what I just said. Neither the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) nor any other can have such a matter appended to *Hansard*, no matter how much they might want to.

Mr. Prud'homme: By unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Not even by unanimous consent.

Mr. Tobin: All I can say about the whole matter is that if the Government of Canada was as consistent in delivering on its commitments as is the Speaker in the interpretation of the rules of the House, we would not be here today discussing this dastardly Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: I will be more than happy to make copies of these two telexes which indeed are damning. They point to the misinterpretation and perhaps inadvertent misleading of the House which has occurred in an attempt to try to garner support for this piece of legislation. I would be happy to send copies of them to all Members of Parliament, both in the House and in the Senate. I know they are waiting with bated breath to see the telexes which clearly indicate the Government's complicity in trying to mislead, inadvertently of course, Members of Parliament in respect of Bill C-75 in the support it receives or does not receive.

Mr. Benjamin: What kind of breath was it?

Mr. Tobin: It was a big one. It is beyond the comprehension of most Canadians. Indeed it is beyond the comprehension of most Members of Parliament who sit here, truly basking in the mood of reform which we thought permeated this place some months ago after the work of the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), the Hon. Member for Papineau, and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper). They headed an all-Party committee on the reform of the House of Commons. Their good work appealed to the integrity in all of us. It also appealed to the lone individual in all of us to stand aside from Party consideration and Party lines occasionally and to exercise our individual conscience and judgment. Despite the appeal to make this place a better place and to make us true legislators in the true sense of the word, the Government has brought in Bill C-75. Notwithstanding the incredible, almost unanimous, well informed body of opinion about the negative consequences of Clause 4 of Bill C-75, the Government of Canada brought that same Bill before Parliament today.