

*Vessel Construction Act*

very important, because without good management-labour relations we can never have a first-class industry in Canada.

**Mr. Mitchell:** If I might say this about labour relations: when you have in unions politics of the kind indicated by the leaders who met recently in a conference, instead of having straight unions such as we find in the railways, you have some difficulty. You cannot play politics with trade union agreements, you understand.

**Mr. Green:** I realize that.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I realize that this is an extremely important matter to the hon. member; but, after all, surely we will have to stick to the measure before the house. The hon. member has been skating all around the question. I shall be glad to deal with the matter of shipbuilding, but I do not think it is fair at this time to go into a complete analysis of the report of the Canadian maritime commission, a large part of which has nothing to do with the bill.

**Mr. Green:** As I said a moment ago, there is to be no further shipping legislation at this session. This bill is presented to the house as the government's solution of the shipbuilding problem in Canada.

**Mr. Chevrier:** No, it is not.

**Mr. Green:** There may be some other plans. I hope there are, because I do not believe this measure will come anywhere near solving the problem. That is the reason I am pointing out these other facts. Canada simply must have a further and broader policy than we are given by the bill, to settle these two problems. The bill merely provides for accelerated depreciation. For example, suggestions have been made that the Canadian coastal trade should be restricted to vessels registered in Canada. I suggest that the minister should tell us whether or not the government will adopt a policy of that kind. The United States has such a policy, as have many other countries. Why should Canada not insist that her coastal vessels at least shall be built in Canadian yards?

The minister said the other day that negotiations were going on between Canada and the United Kingdom in an effort to give Canadian vessels some share of the carrying trade to that country. We do not know whether or not these negotiations have been successful. If some such arrangement could be made it would certainly help. Various other ways have been suggested to keep the shipbuilding and shipping industries on their feet. The Canadian maritime commission has

recommended that there should be a merchant navy of 750,000 deadweight tons, and that 7,000 men should be employed in Canadian shipyards, but it does not recommend how that is to be done. The only solution the minister has produced so far is the present bill. We do not believe it will go far enough to enable Canada to attain the objective which has been set by the government's own commission.

We believe the government is drifting on this question, and that its policy is a faltering one. We believe leadership is required, and that if Canada is to maintain even a reduced merchant navy of 750,000 tons and 7,000 men in her shipyards, there must be some further policy introduced by the government. While the bill is good so far as it goes, it simply does not meet the problem. It is just like trying to kill a grizzly bear with a shotgun.

**Mr. Isnor:** Mr. Chairman, you were certainly most generous in the latitude you gave to the hon. member who has just taken his seat. I trust you will accord me the same privilege.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order. May I say to the hon. member that when I gave that latitude to the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra, he gave me to understand that he was going to be brief. I understand that this will be the case with my hon. friend.

**Mr. Isnor:** Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that I will follow my usual procedure of endeavouring to be brief. In today's mail I received a letter, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

John Ruskin once said that "when we fail to praise a man who deserves praise, two sad things happen; we run the chance of driving him from the right road for want of encouragement, and we deprive ourselves of one of the happiest of our privileges, that of rewarding someone who has earned our appreciation."

I thought that the opening paragraph of the letter I received today expressed my thoughts as to what I should like to say to the Minister of Transport for introducing this measure. It may be true, as the hon. member who has just taken his seat stated, that it does not go far enough, but I am satisfied for the time being to accept it as a step in the right direction by way of assistance to our shipbuilding industry. The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra went into the report of the Canadian maritime commission quite fully. I am going to endeavour to abide by the ruling of the genial chairman and not have him call me to order. I shall only refer briefly to those portions of the report touched on by the hon. member. In doing so, I shall not make my remarks extensive. Instead of reading entire paragraphs, I shall simply refer to them.