

*Canada Shipping Act*

**Mr. Forrestall:** You're a dreamer.

**Mr. Tobin:** Are we now discovering that we have woken up and that the world is a nightmare in which the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, the very cradle of the St. Lawrence Seaway, can say with respect to Clause 4 that there has been no consultation whatsoever? The Montreal Chamber of Commerce also said that the problem is that in the case of Clause 4 of Bill C-75 there has been no prior consultation with either the shipping community or the business community in order to assess the economic and other impacts of the Bill. The Montreal Chamber of Commerce points out that the shipping industry has suffered very heavily economically during the last four or five years and that it is going through a depression. For this reason it is particularly costly and sensitive and will react very quickly to any change in cost.

● (1250)

What does the Canadian Merchant Service Guild say about Clause 4 of Bill C-75? The representatives of that guild are people of few words. They begin by saying that they are against Clause 4. That could not be any clearer. They go on to say that their concern is the loss of jobs because that is their business and that is what could happen.

Canada Steamships Limited has said that the Canadian shipping industry has carefully honed its competitive edge through continuous innovation and productivity and that additional costs will dull that edge, harming them and many important Canadian industries including agriculture.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Do they reject the principle of cost recovery?

**Mr. Tobin:** No, they do not. That is the incredible thing. One would have to have the face of a robber's horse or the nerve of a toothache to make the comment that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Forrestall) just made. Do the representatives of Canada Steamships Limited reject the principle of cost recovery? Of course they do not reject the principle of cost recovery. They do reject the same thing that was rejected by the people who threw bags of tea into Boston Harbour, and that is taxation without representation.

Bill C-75 asks for an authority to impose charges while all of the users of the services are told that they will find out later what charges shall be imposed. They do not reject cost recovery. They reject dictatorship. They reject non-democratic action. They reject taxation without representation or consultation. They reject the arbitrary, arrogant, uncaring, brutal and ruthless move to recover costs even to the extent that it will ruin industries and cost jobs in Canada. That is what they reject.

I am amazed, puzzled, bewildered and absolutely surprised that the Government of Canada has not got that message. The Government promised the dawn of a brand new day for Canada, according to the Prime Minister, but it has not got

the message. I am amazed that the Government of Canada would proceed with this legislation.

I mentioned Canada Steamships Limited. It went on to say that Clause 4 could attempt to achieve a system of cost recovery whereby the high operating budget of the Canadian Coast Guard may be recovered primarily from a Canadian shipping industry which can ill afford additional charges at this time.

Representatives of Ultramar have said that they subscribe to the principle of cost recovery but there is no recognition that Canadian cost recovery policies need to be closely co-ordinated with those of the United States. As I pointed out earlier, the St. Lawrence Seaway is not under exclusive Canadian jurisdiction but under joint jurisdiction. We cannot even get our act together when managing that jointly. How in the name of heaven does the Government expect the people of Canada or, for that matter, the Americans to have any confidence that the Government is able and prepared to negotiate a comprehensive trade agreement if it cannot even run a seaway with coherent policies, particularly as it applies to user charges?

The Petroleum Association for the Conservation of the Environment wishes to endorse the position of seeking cost recovery but wants consultation on how charges are to be imposed before legislation is passed. The Canadian Shippers' Council has said the following:

You can be sure that any user-fees the Coast Guard levies will be passed directly to exporters with a consequent reduction in our competitiveness. User-fees for Coast Guard services could result in some cargo being diverted through the U.S. transportation system and through U.S. ports.

Let me read that again, Mr. Speaker. The Canadian Shippers' Council—note that it is Canadian—has said:

User-fees for Coast Guard services could result in some cargo being diverted through the U.S. transportation system and through U.S. ports.

What did I just say, Mr. Speaker? I just said that traffic on the Welland Canal is down by 22 per cent and that 37 million metric tons were carried on the Montreal-Lake Ontario section, a reduction of more than 20 per cent. Revenues are down by \$11 million over the previous year. Traffic is moving to U.S. transportation systems creating jobs and new industries south of the border and increasing volumes on the Mississippi. The Seaway Authority is collapsing. The Canadian Shippers' Council is saying that user-fees will result in cargo being diverted south of the border.

Let us understand what we are talking about. We are not talking about inanimate objects being diverted south of the border. We are not talking about barges being diverted south of the border. We are not even talking about grain or cargo being diverted south of the border. We are talking about human beings. That is what these numbers symbolize. We are talking about jobs. We are talking about the ability to put bread and butter on the table. That is what is being diverted south of the border.

The people who currently hold the jobs that will be lost cannot move south of the border to take up those jobs. They