

Canada Shipping Act

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
Motion agreed to.

EXCISE TAX ACT (2)

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of State (Finance)) moved that a Ways and Means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act (2), laid upon the Table on Wednesday, October 16, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: On division.
Motion agreed to.

EXCISE ACT

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of State (Finance)) moved that a Ways and Means motion to amend the Excise Act, laid upon the Table on Wednesday, October 16, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: It is the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: On division.
Motion agreed to.

* * *

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AND RELATED ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Wednesday, October 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-75, an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act and to amend the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, the Maritime Code Act and the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the amendment of Mr. Henderson (p. 7687).

Mr. John Parry (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak on Bill C-75 and to deal with some of the questions of impact on not only the ridings which directly border the Seaway but also the inland ridings. Perhaps some of the Members who represent these inland ridings do not realize the impact that the proposed amendments will have on them.

Primarily, as has been mentioned, the Bill addresses the question of marine transportation and pollution. There are several amendments in the Bill which are necessary to bring the Act and Canada's shipping practices into line with international procedures, some of which are imposed by agreement to which Canada subscribes. Most of the Bill deals with such matters as licensing and certification of personnel. There are new regulations contained in the Bill, which I am sure all Members of the House would welcome given the disastrous impacts of maritime pollution, with respect to such matters as the transportation of hazardous cargoes and the prevention

and clean-up of pollution among which, of course, the principal fear is oil spills.

The Bill provides new regulatory powers, something which we can only look at with a little puzzlement since we have heard the Government's declared intention to abandon regulation of the transportation industries to a large degree. Yet, the Bill proposes some instruments which will enable further regulations. Indeed, the Bill goes a lot further in that respect. In it there are some rather insidious clauses which I believe run counter to the very notion of responsibility in a Crown corporation and which, indeed, run counter to some sound commercial practices which should otherwise be applied.

Clause 4 of the Bill constitutes enabling legislation to allow the Government to recover the costs of navigational services provided by the Coast Guard. This is a development at which the House should look very carefully. I hope it will receive a great deal of study in committee since it would place powers in the hands of the Government which I believe could well be detrimental to the entire Seaway system and, indeed, to the entire system of bulk goods transportation in Canada.

Under this legislation the Government would have the right to recover costs involved with such services as setting and maintaining marker buoys, providing radar and Loran-C, vessel traffic services, ice-breaking, escorting services and dredging. According to the latest Estimates the cost of providing these services is in the range of \$136 million to \$191 million. The amount to be recovered is not indicated anywhere in the Bill which is before us. Indeed, the sort of recovery which might be imposed could go from the sublime to the ridiculous.

I remember when I was younger I read a book on an American adventurer of the 1920s and 1930s, Mr. Richard Halliday. One of his stunts, shall we say, in those days was that he would swim the entire length of the Panama Canal. He did so and recorded that at one lock he was charged a fee of a 36 cents to swim through it. That was the lockage charge for a swimmer through the Panama Canal. One would hope that the Government does not intend to go to that level of detail. However, there is nothing in the Act which would prevent it from doing so. As the Act presently provides, costs could be imposed on any nature of vessels which could run the gamut from canoes right up to the largest vessels capable of using the Seaway system.

Over the past few years we have seen some of the dissension, confusion and resistance which has been generated within the aviation community as the Government has moved to impose all manner of tariffs and user charges upon members of the general aviation community. During those same years there has been a marked decrease in the amount of pleasure flying and in the amount of general aviation carried on in Canada. That is not something which can be merely blamed upon the recessionary trends of the period since we have no way of disaggregating those trends from the trend of these nuisance fees which raise the cost of operations and which impose