

and urge his colleague to respond to the very legitimate requests of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, and convince him to change his mind and not resort to Clause 4, at least not until the situation has been straightened out. Clause 4 should not have been included in Bill C-75 to begin with, but at least I hope the Government will accept the amendment now before the House under which the authority of the Minister would be restricted to some extent.

[English]

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I remind the distinguished former Minister of his comments at second reading on October 17, 1985 as reported at page 7743 of *Hansard*. In responding to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) he said:

In answer to the Hon. Minister, I want to tell him that in some cases I would agree with some charges, but in other cases I think it is totally irresponsible—

● (1540)

That is the point of the observation which the former Minister has made. Might I ask the Hon. Member broadly and generally whether or not he totally disagrees with the Auditor General and whether or not he totally agrees?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[Translation]

**Mr. Robichaud:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The Hon. Member for Westmorland—Kent (Mr. Robichaud) on a point of order.

**Mr. Robichaud:** Mr. Speaker, I simply want to know whether there should have been a question and comment period after the remarks of my colleague. Is that normal procedure?

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Unfortunately not. There is no period for questions and comments after the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary. The Parliamentary Secretary has the floor on debate.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Mr. Speaker, that may come as some surprise to the distinguished Member, who I might say has made extraordinarily interesting interventions on a number of occasions in committee and has brought forward what can only be considered as some very reasonable suggestions, as indeed did his colleague, the Hon. Member for Humer—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin), in the Liberal Party, as did the New Democratic Party.

These amendments were intended to strengthen the Bill and were amendments which reflect clearly the intention of the Government to listen and respond to the comments and observations not only of opposition Parties but of the Canadian Council of Boating Associations, the Seafarers International Union, and I could go on. The list is almost without end. We

### *Canada Shipping Act*

did listen and we did respond. The Bill is strengthened in all areas, there is no doubt about that.

Of all of the representations from the over 60 witnesses representing some 28 associations, which were heard by the legislative committee, only one brief disagreed with the fundamental principle of recovering some of the costs incurred by the Canadian Coast Guard in providing services to marine and maritime users in Canada. There was only one single disagreement. Everybody else agreed. I fail to understand what the Opposition's concern is, other than obstruction. I hesitate to say that because we are just now moving into report stage.

**An Hon. Member:** It is provocation.

**Mr. Forrestall:** I would ask the Hon. Member whether he is prepared to rise in his place and give unanimous consent, say tomorrow, to move to third reading. Of course he is not prepared to do that.

From the Great Lakes Seaway Corporation through to the boat users, from canoeists through to ship owners, the Dominion Marime Association, everybody agrees with the principle. To meet the very legitimate concerns and a legitimate question raised by the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), the Minister has agreed not to move with this Bill in the proclamation of Clause 4 which amends Section 3.1 of the Canada Shipping Act until, at the earliest, January, 1987, or to move with the implementation of any charges until, at the latest, January 1, 1988.

I understand the arguments that have been put so far in opposition to us opening up an Act and including matters which have not as yet had the benefit of consultation. Let me respond to that. Historically we seldom open up a major piece of legislation. Here we have opened up a major piece of legislation in Canadian life, namely, the Canada Shipping Act. I think it was incumbent upon us, as we opened it, to deal with the six international conventions and five international codes, primarily dealing with safety at sea, safety of the lives of seamen, construction standards, operational standards and certification of these people in one broad category and in another broad category, the enhancement from present levels of national compensation capacity to international standards of compensation for those affected by oil pollution and spills. The movement toward that, which is 95 per cent of the Bill, is essential, urgent and must be dealt with. To raise the specious argument that nobody agrees with the right to impose certain charges for partial recovery of costs of the provision of services is bewildering, unless you consider it purely in the political context.

I repeat again, every single witness who appeared before the legislative committee, and I might add, with one exception every single witness who appeared on the freedom to move question in the Standing Committee on Transport, agreed that it is right and proper that the taxpayer recover some of the costs—not all, by any stretch of the imagination, but some of the costs of providing Coast Guard services. That is all that is contemplated. If you want to do the definitive arithmetic now