

*Canada Shipping Act*

merchant marine. The question that we are debating this afternoon regarding the viability of industries is at the very heart of that particular question.

My colleague has given me the opportunity to point out that if the movement of forest products from this country was affected by increased costs, there would be very unfortunate consequences for the industry. The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) came to northwestern Ontario two or three weeks ago to discuss with us the dangers facing lumber producers. At that point, we were thinking primarily of lumber producers being faced with the prospect of Congressional action which could put countervailing duties against Canadian lumber products or take even more drastic forms like the Gibbon Bill. When we spoke to people in the industry, we found that they were underscoring the closeness with which they had to cut their costs and the fact that they were making very little money when trees are being cut 200 miles from the mill and trucks have to go back and forth. That 400-mile round trip creates an incredible cost.

I might note, since it was one of the most interesting days in the early part of this parliamentary Session, that when we were debating last December the question of sales and excise tax increases, there was a most interesting debate on the question of a reduction in the rebate on the fuel tax for fuel used by the forestry industry not only for equipment but for transportation. I am sure you would agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons the combined Opposition defeated the Government on a voice vote that auspicious Wednesday afternoon was that a number of private government Members were convinced along with us that the sales tax should not apply to fuel being used by logging trucks operating on the roads.

The Hon. Member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco) spoke with some passion on this particular matter that day and he was only one of the private government Members who felt strongly along with my colleagues and particularly my colleague, the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan, about that point. That is a little bit of parliamentary history illustrating the same point we are discussing today.

Where we can avoid costs, let us find the means to do so in order to ensure that the industries remain viable, employment is maintained and profits continue to be made. After all, we do need some kind of a base for taxation, and let a New Democrat say so occasionally.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 46, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Income Tax—Introduction of minimum tax; the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Attewell)—Customs and Excise—Planned reductions in inspection personnel; the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker)—Fisheries (a) Refinancing of Fishery Products International (b) Company's social responsibility.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADA SHIPPING ACT, ARCTIC WATERS POLLUTION PREVENTION ACT, MARITIME CODE ACT, AND THE OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed 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 in consequence thereof be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate today in the discussion on Bill C-75, the Canada Shipping Act. Let me say at the outset that I agree with the Hon. Member for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception (Mr. Johnson) who indicated that there are many amendments contained in this Bill that are long overdue, much needed and proper. Having said that, let me also say that in some very important ways, this piece of legislation is more noteworthy for what is not contained within it than for what is.

Nearly four years ago on February 15, 1982, the drilling rig *Ocean Ranger* went down off the coast of my home province and took with it 84 lives. Among those 84 lives were 69 Canadians and 56 fellow Newfoundlanders. One of the ways the Government of the day, in conjunction with the Government of Newfoundland, reacted after some weeks and months to that tragic disaster was to commission a joint federal-provincial royal commission to examine the circumstances that led up to the disastrous night of February 15, 1982, to examine the regulations that were in place at the time of the disaster to