

resources on an ongoing basis, then clearly those vessels should be constructed here and the jobs created here.

The other exemptions I think make a lot of sense, although perhaps there might be some reason to use a particular exemption as a triggering mechanism. For example, exemption (c) deals with a ship, as it states:

engaged in cruising, where the ship has overnight accommodation for one hundred passengers or more;

Again, it is a balancing act.

I will give you an example. The City of Thunder Bay has applied to host the Commonwealth Games. Part of its proposal is to use cruise ships to provide 5,000 beds in order to accommodate the influx of tourists to watch the games. Part of the package involves a possible cruise up to Thunder Bay, perhaps from St. John's, bringing people to the games. Those people would then leave Thunder Bay by air, rail or bus. We probably do not have available in Canada enough vessels so we would have to get an exemption. If, on the other hand, should it happen that we rekindle the days of the *Noronic* and other passenger vessels which plied the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence, and it became apparent that this was going to be a permanent arrangement, then that is when we say we must have a Canadian built, Canadian manned, and Canadian registered vessel. Some lead time would have to be allowed for financing and construction and you would not want to interrupt the ongoing service, but once the ships were ready we could say thank you to the people who loaned us the vessel or vessels and get on with doing our own job. We think that kind of thing is worth looking at.

Exemption (d) and (e) states:

engaged in any ocean research activity commissioned by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans;

(e) operated or sponsored by a foreign government that has sought and received the consent of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to conduct marine scientific research;

I assume that is the Jacques Cousteau clause. Exemption (f):

engaged in salvage operations, except where such operations are performed in Canadian waters.

I suspect that means within the 200-mile limit. We might want to look at those once we get this into committee. I say to the Parliamentary Secretary that there may be a need to allow for some additional protection. We have an ever growing industry in Canada that deals with robotics, underwater research, underwater manipulation of equipment, mini-sub and what have you. Perhaps we have to look at that as well to see whether we should be using this legislation as a tool to enhance that fledgling industry.

I do not want to continue dealing with this Bill clause by clause. I have made my point. Hopefully I have been able to plant some seeds in the minds of officials who I know are watching this debate and who will be appearing before us in committee, as well as the Parliamentary Secretary and his

Coasting Trade and Commercial Marine Activities Act

Minister. I recognize that the Minister is not in Ottawa, but is out performing his duties. We will take those things into account.

Let us come up with an even better Bill. Let us improve this so that when we finish third reading we can say we have done our share to promote the shipbuilding and ship repairing industry in this country. We have done it for Canadians, with Canadians. That is the goal we have to aim for.

One or two of my colleagues will want to add their comments. I think the Hon. Member for Comox—Powell River (Mr. Skelly) will give us the perspective of the Pacific Coast and the impact there. The Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Harris) will of course want to deal with Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada. Perhaps we will even hear from the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton).

I do not want to prolong the debate because I think it makes sense to get this Bill into committee and give time for those concerned and who have not yet seen the legislation, which is unfortunate, to have a chance to indicate what improvements we can make. I look forward to the rest of the debate and the improvements that will ensue over the next little while.

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to participate in the debate on the coasting trade in Canada. I would like to make the linkage between this legislation and the necessity for strengthening shipbuilding in Canada, and comment on some of the things we can do to improve this Bill in order to strengthen that industry. However, before I commence my remarks, I would like to comment on the remarks of the Hon. Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet).

When that Member was part of the Cabinet in previous Liberal Governments, those Governments visited a disaster on the shipbuilding industry and coastal trade in Canada. I sat in my seat amazed at the speech he gave in this House criticizing the Government. That criticism was absolutely ridiculous. The people who heard it must have been amazed. I met with delegations from regions of the country where shipbuilding was absolutely flattened, which delegations the Member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), his Cabinet colleagues, and many elected Liberal Members of Parliament refused to even see. They refused to consider in any way, shape, or form the appeals they made to have some attention paid to the industry in order to have it strengthened.

• (1630)

The record of that Government was extremely bad with regard to the shipbuilding industry. It ignored and treated with contempt delegations from the industry, the communities which depended upon shipbuilding, and the workers who were laid off from the shipyards. Quite frankly, the record of that Government was disgusting.

During the election campaign of 1984 there was a great deal of optimism which was underpinned by Conservative promises