

*Government Orders*

going to be sufficient to deal with this issue. This really points out in a microcosm the essence of the problems which this bill tries to deal with.

On the one hand, while we are hoping to encourage a strong and vital Canadian coastal shipping trade, we likewise recognize the need to ensure that services are available at a reasonable price and with the competitive choice that in the long run provides the most economic and most worthwhile service.

Under the circumstances, the regulation making power is the one to look to because of the fact that it provides the flexibility to deal with the situation in an involving fashion rather than risking the possibility that through competition, which could be on an uneven playing field, given the relative economic strength of the players, we could be in peril of losing the Canadian shipper.

Although I am sympathetic with the motion, for those reasons I am not inclined to support it. However, I do find it interesting that the government, in this case, is willing to argue that its ability to regulate is sufficient to ensure the protection of the Canadian shipping industry. In other cases, in committee and even with the motion we debated earlier, it was resisting regulatory powers.

For example, regarding the licence granting power contained in sections 4 and 5 of the act, it was moved and debated at committee that the power itself should be discretionary. In other words, give the minister the right to decide whether it is good to grant a licence. In those cases, the government refused to give the minister that discretion. In this case, it is relying on the discretion to answer the concerns raised by the NDP member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan. I find it more than slightly ironic and somewhat discouraging.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question is on the first motion of Mr. Angus. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**An hon. member:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Negatived on division.

Motion negatived.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan)** moved:

That Bill C-33 be amended at clause 4 by

a) striking out line 9 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

“party are valid and in force;”

b) by striking out line 13 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

“foreign ship; and (f) the owners of the ship have provided sufficient guarantees that all laws of Canada including laws respecting labour standards and revenue shall be obeyed”.

He said: Mr. Speaker, during the committee hearings on Bill C-33 and its previous bill, Bill C-52 which died just before the last election, we heard from labour in particular a legitimate concern about foreign vessels coming in and taking our jobs and cutting our competitive ability as a nation to have an effective marine industry.

They expressed concern about a ship that has met the criteria and the minister has granted them an exemption to come in and provide service that “is not being provided, is not available by an existing Canadian ship”. But if they are operating at \$100 per month crew levels, if they are not following our same kind of health and safety standards, our very strong health and safety standards in the marine sector, then they are undercutting our ability. That in itself puts pressure on our marine companies, which in turn will put pressure on the government to dilute our laws.

We have certainly had the call from the maritime sector for the second registry which would allow Canadian flagships to operate outside of our waters and not pay any income taxes or the crews would not pay any income taxes in order to deal with the reality of the international maritime industry.

What they would like is a built-in protection that is written in law, that is there and stands out in the Coastal Trading Act, not in Revenue Canada’s acts or the Income Tax Act, not in the Immigration Act. They want something in black and white in the piece of legislation that deals with coastal trading that says that the owners of the ship have provided sufficient guarantees that all laws of Canada, including laws respecting labour standards and revenue shall be obeyed.