

Canada Shipping Act

over into the harbour. We know that a revolution followed shortly after the action taken by the American colonies.

I would suggest to the Government that the fact that it has earned a 211-seat majority at the election is no reason to treat Canada as a collection of colonies that shall be dictated to from on high by those who occupy the ivory towers of Ottawa. We ought to pay close attention to what the primary producers out there in the land are saying about this Bill.

Who are some of these primary producers that I am talking about? The Council of Boating Organizations of Canada says that "Clause 4 departs from the principle of cost recovery by Government, that principle being based on the theory of user payment. It is the council's contention that Parliament should not delegate a taxing power to the Canadian Coast Guard". Who are they? They represent tens of thousands of private non-commercial individuals who operate pleasure craft for the enjoyment of themselves and their families.

The Great Lakes Waterways Development Association says about Clause 4, "The clause as it stands is too broad in scope, and as a result has the potential of causing major disruption to the lake shipping industry, and shippers are left with no assurance that it will achieve the announced objective of deficit reduction".

Thirteen days ago we began the debate on this Bill and at that time the Parliamentary Secretary stood in his place and referred to the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association as an organization that supported Clause 4. The Parliamentary Secretary no doubt is by now aware that the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association a day after we began the debate 13 days ago, having heard of the Parliamentary Secretary's remarks, sent a telex to every single Member of this House saying that the Parliamentary Secretary is wrong, "We do not endorse Clause 4. We are opposed to it, and he has taken our comments out of context".

More to the point, Canada Steamship Lines, whom the Parliamentary Secretary also indicated was supportive of the Bill, also sent a telex to every single Member of Parliament, all 282 of us, and to Members of the Senate, saying that, "To the extent that the Parliamentary Secretary has suggested that our company is supportive of this Bill, we are not supportive of the Bill, we see it as a Draconian measure, an unrepresentative measure, one that we would like to see defeated".

I just take a moment to set the record straight, because I know that the Parliamentary Secretary, when he has the opportunity to have the floor again, would do so himself. Despite being given the burdensome responsibility of piloting this flawed and festering piece of legislation through the House, in the final analysis the Hon. Member is an honourable gentleman. Since I expect to speak for a few more minutes, I thought I would set the record straight for him. I know he appreciates it.

• (1430)

The St. Lawrence Shipowners' Association said about this Bill: "We do not agree that we should give the Government a blank cheque which would allow it to set up a fee system about which we know nothing at the present time."

Mr. Crosby: You want us to continue all of the subsidization—

Mr. Tobin: I hope I do not take the Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) out of context, but he is basically saying that he considers the shipping industry that is important to the vitality of the City of Montreal as people who want subsidies forever. He is saying that the shipping industry, which attended the Montreal Economic Summit, that attended the Sept Iles Economic Summit, is a parasitic bunch of people. I do not believe that Conservative cabinet Ministers nor Conservative Members from Quebec would agree that the shipping industry in the Province of Quebec is composed of nothing but parasites on the Treasury of Canada.

Mr. Crosby: Do not display your ignorance.

Mr. Tobin: I reject such disparaging remarks about the Province of Quebec by the Conservative Member in the presence of his own colleagues who try to represent their province. Is it any wonder that Quebec Members have no clout in Cabinet and are unable to stop Clause 4, which will so negatively impact the St. Lawrence Seaway and the City of Montreal? One of their own colleagues from Halifax is describing the Quebec industry as nothing but a bunch of parasites. I hope the people of Quebec are not made aware of this kind of scurrilous accusation being made against them.

Mr. Crosby: Name one container ship owned in Quebec.

Mr. Tobin: Quite frankly, I believe that Quebec has a role to play in this country and we should not underestimate the value and the importance of the St. Lawrence Seaway, not only to the Port of Montreal but to all regions of the country. Such dog in the manger attitude must simply come to an end.

Before I was so rudely interrupted, I was talking about the St. Lawrence Shipowners' Association who the Member for Halifax West believes are parasites. I do not consider them as parasites. I do not think that the fishermen who are opposed to this Bill are parasites. I do not believe that the potato farmers who are opposed to this Bill are parasites, nor the National Farmers' Union, nor the Council of Forest Industries in British Columbia who are opposed to this Bill. It is simple to put such a tag on people who would attempt to tell Parliament that it has moved without due consultation. Those groups are not parasitic at all. They have done their homework, which is more than can be said for the Government that has introduced this Bill.

The St. Lawrence Shipowners' Association said: "We do not agree that we should give the Government a blank cheque."