

thinking. I have gone over it again. I said to myself, "It must be there." Yet I cannot find it.

Again it comes down to the French text being so short. It is in subsection (iii) of 3(a). It says in English—and the preamble is about the same—"from one port or place in Canada to the same or another port or place in Canada". This is translated on the French side as, "Entre des ports et lieux du Canada". I think that probably does carry the sense. The other section in the English text is there, yet I cannot find its meaning in the French text. Following the (iii) under section 3 we find the words "whether directly or by way of a foreign port".

We might go back to the notion which was floated yesterday, the suggestion, concerning which we seek clarification, that in the Superior Court before French-speaking judges there is a practice of using historical documents and then they would realize what we were getting at—that the English version said one thing and that in the absence of that particular clause in French we intended that it be in the French version. But surely in a country such as ours we should make sure that it is in both texts. There is nothing I can see in the French text which conveys the message conveyed by the final phrase of section 3(a), namely, "whether directly or by way of a foreign port". It is there implicitly but not otherwise. Why does it have to be explicit in one language and implicit in the other?

Mr. Goodale: I do not profess to be an expert on translation, and I appreciate the concern the hon. member has raised. But I think, if I am not mistaken, that this particular issue was dealt with in motion No. 1, standing in the name of the minister, where clause 8(3)(a) is amended by adding a phrase which to my way of thinking specifically covers the point which the hon. member has raised. I think that motion should resolve the problem. The amendment was designed to cover the very point which has been raised.

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

Mr. Forrestall: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think there is agreement that this and two other votes should be deferred until five o'clock on Tuesday afternoon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on motion No. 2 in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall).

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Mr. Forrestall: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I am not sure what procedure we are attempting to follow. You have just put a very specific question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The Chair has to ask for the yeas and nays, and then we shall defer the vote.

All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Maritime Code

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. Pursuant to standing order 75(2) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

● (1430)

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, the vote is to be deferred until Tuesday of next week at five o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Will five members please stand.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to section (2) of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East) moved:
Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-61, an act to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be amended in clause 10 by deleting lines 31 and 32 at page 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"renewal or terminating later than September 24, 1978".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will see if it is possible to get another 35 or 40 minutes out of a one-liner. Years ago when I was working for the *Halifax Herald*, being taught by a now distinguished deputy minister of the government of Nova Scotia, I would be called into the newsroom because it was my job for a long time to make an eight or ten paragraph story out of some little news release. I do not know whether I learned my lesson well.

The purpose of this motion is to attempt to give some recognition to the notice given by the government under the former minister of transport to our member Commonwealth countries of our intention to withdraw from the Commonwealth shipping arrangement. The act calls for a termination date in April of 1980, and I am suggesting that it be on September 24, 1978. Notice of this intention was formally served on the United Kingdom and other Commonwealth nations which participate in the Commonwealth shipping arrangements in 1973.

We suggest that we withdraw from these arrangements on September 24, 1978, for a variety of reasons. It is many years since those interested in the redevelopment of a Canadian merchant marine initiated the action that we are discussing in parliament today. There can be no occasion for any shipping company operating under a Commonwealth flag to complain that they were not adequately forewarned of our intention, of which notice was served in 1973. We are fully in accordance with the five-year notice and we went through the one-year period before formal notice could be given. Formal notice was then given that we would subsequently withdraw from the Commonwealth shipping arrangement.

In support of my argument I should like to quote briefly from the evidence given to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications on December 11, 1975, at