

Canada Shipping Act

charges are going to be. The Seafarers International Union says we cannot have full cost recovery if the Canadian marine industry is to survive.

Imagine, not only the fellows in the corporate boardrooms of the shipping companies, not only the fisherman at the end of the wharf sitting on his lobster pot, but the unions representing the employees of those fellows who sit in their corporate boardrooms are coming to this conclusion. Of course, they say, we will lose jobs on certain cargoes, the lake companies will just not be able to compete. The union is standing up and defending the interests of their employer. Is that not an incredible phenomenon? How often do we see the union coming before a legislative committee to say that the boys in the corporate boardrooms, sitting in their concrete and glass towers at the end of a fat cigar, are right? This Bill is irresponsible.

● (1210)

The Canadian Harbour Commission reports there is great potential for discrimination in such an open ended legislation as proposed in the new Clause 4 against Canadian ports. Having regard to the international association of Great Lake Ports, the single concern of this organization is the future competitiveness of the Great Lakes. Its competitiveness is now threatened. Toll increases announced in 1986 will result in a further decrease in volume. Charges imposed as a result of Clause 4 will cause deterioration of an already faltering system.

I noted on the national news last week that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was in the Province of Quebec and he met with the Minister of Transportation for that Province, Mr. Côté. He also met with the Premier of Quebec. I think we are all aware in this Parliament that one of the great issues about which discussions take place in meetings between federal Government and provincial Government representatives in Quebec is the issue of the Constitution. I am sure that was discussed. You know, Mr. Speaker, being from the great Province of Quebec, that the economy in Quebec is also on the minds of the people of Quebec and her representatives. Despite the other important matters on the table in the meeting between the Prime Minister and the Premier of Quebec, what do we see on the national news? We saw the Prime Minister come out and tell reporters that he will have another look at Clause 4 of Bill C-75 before third reading.

Well, it is third reading time and the Prime Minister, if he has had another look, obviously did not take seriously this new mode of co-operation rather than confrontation, consultation rather than unilateral action. He did not take seriously the representations of the Minister of Transportation of Quebec, Mr. Côté, and the Premier of Quebec, who said get rid of Clause 4; when you can tell us how it is going to impact on our province and our industries then we are prepared to say yes, let us have some cost recovery, but get rid of it in the meantime.

What happened? The Prime Minister gave his commitment; he was going to have another look. Three or four days later, as

is usually the case when the Prime Minister gives his commitment, the world proceeds as usual, nothing has changed. Clause 4 is still retained as the most controversial item in the Bill.

One of the international associations of Great Lakes Ports says the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway system is a shared asset of Canada and the United States. For the first time in the history of the Seaway each country is moving unilaterally on matters involving the Seaway. Think about that. The St. Lawrence Seaway was built in the '50s, '40s, at a cost of \$450 million at the time, shared between both countries, as a great artery of transportation through the North American continent jointly managed by both countries, an example of how we can co-operate and live together. That system, in the face of an attempt by the administration to engage in a free trade regime between our countries, is now going to be the subject of a joint administrative process which is going off in two different directions. Here is the Prime Minister of Canada telling the people of Canada that he can work out a comprehensive trade package for the country between Canada and the United States, and at the same time the Prime Minister of the country and his Government cannot work out a joint management system of the St. Lawrence Seaway system.

Some people are saying the Member is exaggerating. Surely it is not all that bad. Surely there is no problem. Let me enlighten Members and Canadians about what our partners in the management of the St. Lawrence Seaway are saying about this particular Bill and Clause 4.

Mr. Donald Rothwell, the President of the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association wrote the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner), on June 3, only nine days ago, asking that the Leader of the Opposition ensure that Clause 4 not be retained in the Bill, that we speak against it. My leader responded and assured Mr. Rothwell that, indeed, we would raise the points he was concerned about during the course of the debate in Parliament.

Mr. Rothwell is a very hard working fellow. He quite nicely included in the letter he sent the Leader of the Opposition a number of what he thought were relevant representations that have been made regarding Clause 4. Let us examine some of those representations.

We have a letter here to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney, from ULS International Inc., obviously on friendly footing with the Prime Minister. It states:

Dear Brian: I would like to draw to your attention our concern over Clause 4 of Bill C-75. In its present form the authority it provides this and future Governments to charge for coast guard services is virtually unconstrained. As a result the potential for economic dislocation to the detriment of Great Lakes-St. Lawrence traffic is opened. Bearing in mind your interest in the economic progress of ports on the Lower St. Lawrence—

That is an area the Prime Minister knows something about, he represents that part of Quebec, or near that part of Quebec.