

Maritime Code

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

We now go on to motion No. 6 in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East) moved: Motion No. 6.

That Bill C-61, an act to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be amended in clause 11 by

- (a) deleting the word "and" in line 6 at page 15
- (b) striking out line 9 at page 15 and substituting the following therefor:
coasting trade of Canada; and
- (c) while the ship is operating under the licence, the employees aboard will be Canadian or landed immigrants, and the operator of the ship will comply with the Canada Labour Code, the Immigration Act, the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act and, in general, with the laws, regulations and standards that are applicable to a business or enterprise operated in Canada under federal jurisdiction.

Motion No. 7.

That Bill C-61, to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be amended in clause 11 by adding immediately after line 48 at page 15 the following:

- (6) 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.

He said: Mr. Speaker, here, again, I think perhaps we erred a little. I draw to the attention of hon. members the fact that these two motions bear no relationship whatsoever. They deal with entirely different aspects of this section of the bill. I will deal with motion No. 6 first.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I gather that the hon. member is proceeding to discuss these two motions. I should like to have a ruling on the point. It is my opinion that a vote on one motion should not automatically be a vote on the other one. Personally, I object to these two motions being grouped together. One motion involves people working on ships and the protection they are given under a number of acts, and the other motion evolves around the problem of licensing, the obtaining and renewing of licences. Therefore, I should like to suggest that these two motions not be grouped together because a vote on one should not affect the other. Unless someone convinces me that there is some relationship between the two, I think they should be put separately and voted on separately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It was my understanding that a vote on motion No. 1 will dispose of motion No. 5, a vote on motion No. 2 will dispose of motion No. 3, motion No. 4 will be voted on separately, a vote on motion No. 6 will dispose of motion No. 7, a vote on motion No. 8 will be taken separately, and motion No. 9 will be voted on separately. I also understand that there was agreement to that.

Mr. Peters: Whether or not it was agreed upon, I should like to make the point now that there is no relationship between the two.

Mr. Harquail: Do you not respect agreements?

[The Acting Speaker.]

Mr. Peters: The hon. member, who knows nothing about the bill, probably, does not know either what bill we are discussing. He should be aware of the difficulty of taking a vote on a subject which has no bearing on another subject. This is a very complex bill, but I think even the parliamentary secretary who appears to have responsibility for the bill will agree that there is no relationship between the two motions. Although an agreement may have been reached by members who are not too familiar with the bill, there is a legitimate reason for raising this point.

● (1500)

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I just want to inform the hon. member and the House that I happen to be a member in good standing of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. Apparently he is not aware of that.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, that really does not tell me anything. The hon. member may well be what he says. However, I attended several meetings of that Committee and met a number of members who really did not know much about it.

The point raised by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) should be considered. It would seem to me that in taking those votes we should be able to make a decision on a fact, rather than have two separate facts involved where the votes may be contrary on both facts.

Mr. Forrestall: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just resumed his seat is quite correct.

For the benefit of hon. members, the amendment proposes adding after line 48 at page 15, new subsection, (6). This proposes to include in the act the procedure whereby an affected person may have the right to appeal or declare his interest to the regulatory body, the Canadian Transport Commission, in respect to the issuance of a licence.

The other amendment deals very clearly with the working conditions and rules and regulations under which ships operate in Canada—the waters, the crews, etc.

I apologize to the Chair and the Chamber because it was my understanding that we could discuss the two lumped together but that a vote would be called on each.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comments made by the two previous speakers about the lack of substantial connection between these two particular motions. While it was agreed yesterday, as Your Honour read just a few moments ago, that a vote on motion No. 6 would dispose of motion No. 7, with all deference I think we should reconsider this. Let us say we dispose of motion No. 6; that could not possibly dispose of motion No. 7.

My early recollections of political science are that parliament could do practically anything but make a man a woman! It can agree to something one day, but surely there is a procedure by which it can "unagree" what we agreed yesterday in respect to the voting procedures on these two motions. It is inconceivable that disposing of one will dispose of the other by a procedural device of that sort.