

broadsword, has gone through the muscle, has glanced off bone, has gone deep into the bone, and has ruptured the spleen and marrow which are essential to the rejuvenation of any body.

Mr. Gormley: The champion of mixed metaphors!

Mr. Tobin: The Government has gone right to the core of the economy of all regions, that is, their ability to compete in the world market-place by moving goods and people to where markets are located. I fail to understand—

Mr. Gormley: You also failed English.

Mr. Tobin: We Newfoundlanders are known as people of few words. We are also known as people who lack the ability of some Hon. Members in the House to present our views in a manner consistent with the disciplines of the English language. We apologize for that. We are ever so humble in the House when we speak. We do our best. We try to make our case. We understand that not all Members have the same capacity or incapacity. We do the best we can, notwithstanding the normal high standard of debate by the Hon. Members of the House, many of whom are here today. However, let me just apologize and continue.

What did the Premier of Ontario have to say about Clause 4 of Bill C-75? He said that there was good reason for serious concern about the negative impact on Canada's transportation and shipping industries as a result of the Bill.

The Government of Canada is about to embark upon a great free trade experiment with the Government of the United States. It is gambling that it can negotiate a satisfactory arrangement on trade between the U.S. and Canada. It is betting that it can reach an agreement which will satisfy Canadians in all parts of the country. However, with Clause 4 of Bill C-75, it is moving unilaterally for the first time in 30 years of joint administration of the St. Lawrence Seaway system. The Seaway is jointly administered by a U.S. commission appointed by the U.S. Government and by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority appointed by the Canadian Government. They have jointly managed the Seaway for 30 years. Clause 4 represents the first time in the joint management of the Seaway that one of the two partners has acted arbitrarily and in isolation of the other. Indeed, the American commission wrote a letter to the Prime Minister pointing out that it was the first time in 30 years that Canada had acted unilaterally and arbitrarily, without consulting the American side, in imposing new user charges.

If we cannot even manage to stay the course or stay on track in the joint management of a system, for which we have had a joint management program for the last 30 years, why is it that Canadians should believe that we have the ability to initiate a new comprehensive free trade agreement representing all our sectors, not just particular segments such as the St. Lawrence Seaway system?

Canada Shipping Act

The Minister of Transport appointed a subcommittee to study the St. Lawrence Seaway and how best the Government of Canada could rescue that ailing system from apparent demise. Apparently it is suffering from a steady and progressive loss of traffic. Yesterday that subcommittee heard from the Thunder Bay Economic Development Corporation. It presented an excellent, well prepared brief. It was entitled "Canada's Third Coast—The Role of Thunder Bay in Future Canadian Export Trade". It almost put a question mark behind the word "Future" because the future of export trade is in doubt with the measures now being proposed by the Government. I commend to all Hon. Members this thorough brief as required reading for those who want to participate in a meaningful way in debate on transport policy.

In respect of the transportation system in the Port of Thunder Bay, the report indicated that in 1985 a number of factors, including grain production shortfalls, poor international sales performance, changing technology, continuing shifting grain traffic to federally assisted West Coast port facilities, and Seaway disruptions, resulted in the permanent loss of an estimated 500 direct jobs. It went on to indicate that higher Seaway and port user charges, as proposed in Clause 4 of Bill C-75, would have a dramatic, negative impact upon port and grain handling activities in Thunder Bay. Also its forecast indicated that unless these proposed cost increases were averted, its area of the transportation sector could permanently lose up to 1,500 direct jobs during the next five years.

The Thunder Bay Economic Development Corporation, having already suffered the loss of 500 permanent jobs and having noted the state of decline in traffic, went on to warn the Government that Clause 4 of the Bill, the user-pay clause, could result in the loss of an additional 1,500 jobs. That is just in the Port of Thunder Bay alone. We must understand that the potential job loss, direct and indirect, in the entire system could indeed amount to tens of thousands.

In dealing with Clause 4 the brief went on to indicate that the enormous economic and social costs of this potential dislocation should be carefully weighed against the very modest net benefits of all proposed cost recovery policies or measures under consideration by the federal Government. Also it indicated that when existing jobs were lost, experience has shown that they are far too difficult and expensive to replace, and that the significance of employment loss was far more acute in an already economically disadvantaged region like northwestern Ontario.

In the face of excellent work carried out by many organizations, several months ago when the Bill was before the legislative committee and as recently as yesterday when the subcommittee was in Thunder Bay, I do not know how the Government in good conscience could persist in bringing this Bill before Parliament.

It must be noted that many witnesses said they were not consulted about Clause 4, that it was a surprise. This indicates a sense that the Government was trying to slip something by them, something fundamental and important. I must note that