

*Transportation*

policy which reflects the belief that the marine mode is a viable transportation industry sector on its own and should be viewed with the same amount of respect as other modes of transportation in this country. Its importance is not to be trifled with or left to the vagaries of the distant future, as the minister would suggest.

● (1650)

Marine transport must be co-ordinated with and made complementary to other marine related industries, such as shipbuilding and repair, the fisheries, and our fledgling but potentially vast ocean resource industry. We must have a marine policy which is freed from present obstacles, disincentives and restrictions. This will permit and encourage the pursuit of targets of opportunity which could be generating billions of dollars for Canada and hundreds of thousand of jobs for Canadians.

Much more specifically, if the minister is concerned about options that are available to us—and he is forever accusing this side of the House of not knowing what it is doing or where it is going—I will suggest a few. These are a few areas the minister could and perhaps should pursue. We should be encouraging the gradual development of a Canadian deep sea fleet by providing tax incentives and deferrals, as well as allowing for flexibility in the timing and claiming of capital cost allowances for new construction. I am not talking about direct subsidies or the pouring of any new money into this venture at all; I am talking about money which is simply not in motion at this time. Tax policies permitting pre-tax dollars to be spent on vessel replacement and low interest loans, similar to the type given by the Export Development Corporation, should be made available now to Canadian shipowners. This will enable them to take advantage of targets of opportunity as they foresee them.

There is another area, that of the far northern waters. The minister has been generous enough in a wishy-washy way to respond to urgings over many years with respect to these waters north of 60 degrees. There is no need to be wishy-washy about that. There is no need for Canadians not to have their full presence in the Arctic with respect to our own extraction of resources and its allied industry. No ships should be in these northern waters other than Canadian ships. These ships should be designed and built in Canada and their crews should be Canadian. They should be subject to Canadian law. There is no need for the present wishy-washy policy at all. The government should clearly say that it will lend assistance to the design and construction of special ships. In this instance we could be talking about the LNG or cargo ships, it does not matter. There is one there already.

As well, we are examining other principles. If we are to attract the support of financial communities interested in investing in marine matters, we should not be wishy-washy. We must clearly indicate to them that their investment will be protected by both regulation and by law. But we have not done that. The minister was not prepared to go even that far. There was some vague suggestion in reaction to our urgings that he

would go a little way down the road, but he has not gone far enough.

A realistic and equitable share of Canadian water-borne trade carried by Canadian bottoms should be encouraged through the negotiation of bilateral trade agreements and with regard to UNCTAD's new code of conduct for liner conferences. These areas should be pursued. The fears of the early 1970s cannot be related to the realities of today. Decisions cannot be made based on those apprehensions. We must make decisions based on the reality of today, not six or seven years ago.

Consistent with the policy of removing obstacles and road blocks to the development of Canada's capability for re-entering deep sea trade, some particular emphasis should be put on the role which Canada should be playing in the development of international maritime codes, perhaps through an organization such as International Maritime Co-ordinating Organization. We should be doing this because standards are now being devised and put into place which do not have the fullest reflection of Canadian needs with respect to our northern waters, our coastal waters and our inland Great Lakes systems.

In furthering the case for Canada's re-entry into deep sea trade, around the world there are a large number of recently built ships which are lying idle. We should encourage Canadian entrepreneurs and ship owners to re-enter the foreign market by permitting them access to this idle ship tonnage and extending to them the benefits that I have just outlined. We should not give them the world. If these people go offshore and acquire a ship and we waive the usual import arrangements, the money and profits earned could and should be set aside on the basis that a Canadian built ship should be the next acquisition. In other words, for every ship bought offshore with government assistance any profits should be turned over to create activity in our Canadian shipyards for the construction of new vessels. This will be a stimulating factor for the shipbuilding industry.

Any marine policy should be better co-ordinated with construction activity in our yards than is the case at the present time. A requirement should be that all ships operating in government service, including ferries, be designed and built in Canadian yards, manned by Canadians and subject to Canadian laws. In my opinion, this can be achieved quite simply. But we do not do that. We have not brought an end to offshore leasing. I see no clear intent on the part of CN Marine and the Department of Transport to do anything meaningful about it. It never surprises me when I pick up a paper to read of a group, perhaps in Norway, Sweden, Germany or the U.K., looking for vessels to charter for our east coast ferry services.

One of the most disgraceful situations which is within the minister's area of competency must continue to be the anomalies in our national ports. In the main estimates tabled the other day I notice that the minister had seen fit to drop the National Harbours Board virtually completely from the itemized statements. I think the phrase "National Harbours Board" shows up somewhere in one of the statements of