

hauling oil for the refinery at Come-By-Chance? Are Canadian ships carrying oil?

● (1510)

**Mr. McGrath:** It is in British bottoms.

**Mr. Forrestall:** There is not one Canadian bottom carrying that oil.

All around, without and within, the ability of Canada to counter effectively world pressures on our foreign trade is severely limited. Worst of all is the over-riding neglect and, to a degree, international mockery to which this Liberal administration has subjected our maritime shipping policy. In a word, we are being laughed at. Mr. Darling tells us the obvious: the government simply does not care.

In the 15 to 20 years of my involvement in politics I have known only one government member, a former minister of transport, who was interested in maritime matters. Twenty years after he began talking about maritime policy the government is acting. I suspect his interest was created by his concern for labour. At least he proposed a maritime policy. Nobody else on the government side did. If the government had shown interest in shipping ten or 15 years ago, the legislation would now be in place and Canadian shipping would be carrying our goods. The north also would have been protected. If the United States had asked for our co-operation with respect to the north, we should have been able to oblige.

I also raise the question of where we buy our technology. We have bought expertise affecting the north from Finland. If the appropriate laws had been in place that would not have been necessary. If we had wanted to buy a certain technology from Finland, for example, we should have been sure that those in Finland would not pick up a telephone, buy the information from a Canadian engineering firm in Montreal, as happened recently, and sell it to us.

The minister probably has not been fully briefed by his department. At some point someone will tell him the amusing story of Canada purchasing information from the United States. The United States people, in turn, obtained the information from Finland, and the Fins obtained it from Canada. And you know what Canada paid for that information? The price was 17 times higher than it would have been a year and a half before, when it was sitting on a shelf in this country collecting dust. That is an interesting story.

**Mr. McGrath:** And is part of the reason for our present mess.

**Mr. Forrestall:** On the matter of a Canadian flag fleet, Mr. Darling expressed the following clear view:

... the use of Canadian flag shipping remains a valid long term objective not to be achieved at one stroke but step by step as our ability to protect our interests in the field becomes established and yields practical results.

We shall see those practical results when the government, conforming to the expressed will of the Canadian people, develops our offshore fleet and protects the extractive industries of the north.

#### *Maritime Code*

Let us put it another way. There is not a single container ship, single tanker, single bulk carrier—and only three merchant ships—flying the Canadian flag on the oceans of the world.

Our oil, bauxite, and general cargo are imported in foreign flag vessels, for a fee. Our wheat, grain, coal, aluminum, steel, and general manufacture are exported by foreign flag vessels, also for a fee, which as noted last year came to an estimated \$1.5 billion.

In addition to the impact upon our maritime regional economies a Canadian merchant fleet would have, it could also provide upward of 10,000 jobs for Canadian merchant sailors. Having said all that, I express to this House the attitude of virtually the entire shipping community that the policy process involved in shipping matters within the federal cabinet is totally inadequate for the 1970's and 1980's. The cabinet being the threshold for all decisions, most necessary decisions simply are not made. We are going too slowly. True, we must go step by step; yet surely we need more than one piece of legislation every three or four years. Let us pass legislation in this area as one package and thereby determine the impact it will have on rail transportation, air transportation, transportation by pipeline, etc.

We have the fullest confidence in the ability of Mr. Illing and his shipping advisory committee to make recommendations to government on this score, and trust the government will act on them with haste. I pay tribute to Mr. Illing and his associates. The task ahead of the committee is enormous, but it seems to be coping reasonably well. We wish him and his associates well in this work, and trust the government will adopt the recommendations of that group expeditiously.

Let me conclude with some general comments. We welcome this bill but wish it had been brought forward in 1973. We wish that we could be considering the balance of the necessary legislation, and that the government had declared its interest with respect to extractive industries north of 60 degrees and its intention to restrict those industries to the exclusive use of Canadian ships, when those ships can perform the task.

Those are all the points I wish to raise at this time, being confident that we can raise substantive matters in committee. We welcome the bill and wish the government success with the implementation of the first part.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Madam Speaker, Bill C-61 is designed to provide a maritime code for Canada. It belatedly and only partially answers the long standing need for a Canadian shipping policy.

Canada is a leading trading nation in the world. We realize, whether one represents a maritime constituency, as I do, or lives in another part of Canada, that a shipping policy which will enable us to send our goods to the markets of the world is absolutely imperative. Unfortunately successive governments have shamefully neglected Canada's shipping interests.

As the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) showed, we export annually about \$8 billion worth of goods and import about \$7 billion worth. On this \$15 billion worth of goods leaving and entering Canada