

We previously experienced circumstances that were to say the least ridiculous and stupid, if not premeditated. For example, we saw ships in the St. Lawrence in Quebec City carry out coastal trade without any authorization. There is nothing in Canadian legislation to force a minimum of respect for our territorial integrity.

Mr. Speaker, we know that existed and will continue to exist. And when we have the possibility of providing in a code in a very specific way terms for having a licence. It seems to me that there is no mistake, that members of this House should understand this excellent amendment before us and it ought to be accepted immediately. Whether it be said that it is implicit in the fact that we are talking about coastal trade in Canada, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that considering the situation that always existed in this area it is important to dot the i's.

And that is why is added as proposed in the amendment the following:

—the employees aboard will be Canadian or landed immigrants, and the operator of the ship will comply with the *Canada Labour Code*, the *Immigration Act*, the *Merchant Seamen Compensation Act* and, in general, with the laws, regulations and standards that are applicable to a business or enterprise operated in Canada under federal jurisdiction."

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) said earlier. It is not possible that we should not agree on that because that would be showing very little national or patriotic feeling. Consequently, I think this amendment should be passed, and there is absolutely no shame to doing so. It is only a motion to strengthen our national pride a bit.

● (1550)

[English]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in dealing with these two motions I intend to be rather brief. There are short yet substantive answers to the specific points raised, particularly by my two hon. friends in the official opposition.

I have some substantial difficulty, however, with the address made to the House earlier this afternoon by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). I shall quote him rather loosely, but I think fairly. In the latter part of his speech he said that we should take a close look at the people with whom we are dealing. I think in hearing his remarks we had an opportunity to take a close look at him. I do not think many of us were pleased by what we heard or saw. I think we saw a negative, non-specific, unfair, irresponsible, and inaccurate attack against people, past and present, who work for the people of Canada through the Ministry of Transport.

The diatribe this member delivered in the House today unhappily is all too typical of the kind of unfairness and irresponsibility we frequently see across the floor on the part of members of the New Democratic Party. I think it is terribly unfortunate that the member has injected into this discussion a note that is totally irrelevant, unfair, and which has detracted from the substantial good work done by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) and the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) in connection with this bill. As I say, it is unfortunate that the member for Timiskaming had to inject such an unfortunate and unhappy tone into the

Maritime Code

debate. He has detracted from the good and constructive discussion we were having prior to his intervention.

May I deal specifically with motions Nos. 6 and 7. In connection with motion No. 6 I have some initial difficulty. I think it is just in respect of the arrangement dealing with the removal of the word "and" in the first part of the motion. I think there might be a technical problem in indicating we are going to an "either/or" situation instead of "and". I think that is a technical problem and is not a substantial problem. There is another point I should like to mention in connection with the major portion of motion No. 6 which has been discussed rather extensively this afternoon.

I see the time is approaching four o'clock, so rather than go into the detail I would simply point out that the second part of the motion deals with the application of the Canada Labour Code and other standards to the operation of unlicensed foreign ships in the coasting trade. Hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich, have indicated that this kind of provision might well be one we would look at very seriously down the road as further books are added to the Maritime Code, but I do not think it would be appropriate to consider it at this stage.

Dealing with motion No. 7, the purpose of clause 11(5) is to expedite proceedings by making the issuance of the licence an administrative act rather than a quasi-judicial act. The right of appeal, however, is retained by the provisions of clause 12. The proposed motion could, I suggest, lead to rather onerous delays in the processing of the applications. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude my comments on these motions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on motion No. 6 in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall). All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75 the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question now is on motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall). All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those opposed will please say nay.