

Adjournment Debate

compared with the following costs: first, the additional administrative costs imposed on the private and public sectors, which will amount to over \$1 million.

Second, the loss of a major part of the American traffic which was until now using Canadian ships, and finally, which is even worse, the obvious damage caused to the entire Canadian maritime transport industry. To conclude, Mr. Speaker, it seems obvious to me that this action goes against the interests not only of the industry, but also of Canada, and I believe that the government would be wise to reconsider its position.

• (2230)

[English]

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. member for La Prairie (Mr. Deniger) for raising an issue which is not only very important to the industry but also to the government.

Allow me to take this opportunity to remind hon. members what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) said when he replied to this question in the House on April 2, that the government has always had taxation systems that varied, depending on the type of transportation. For instance, we have certain taxes for land carriers which are different from those levied on marine carriers. He went on to say that Canadian carriers have a considerable advantage in Canadian ports and that, while in the case of international transportation the same arrangement exists for United States' and Canadian ships, there is no evidence that this factor has any effect on the preference for Canadian over U.S. carriers, or vice versa.

I would like to remind the House of the objective of the transportation fuel compensation recovery charge. It is to ensure the recovery of equivalent federal oil import compensation payments for oil exported in the form of marine fuel. The charge is currently levied on fuel used by domestic and foreign vessels involved in international trade.

The transportation fuel compensation recovery charge on marine fuel, as it pertains to domestic carriers, is based on prevailing competitive fuel prices in U.S. and other relevant international markets. Since fuel prices vary considerably from country to country, and change frequently, this is a matter requiring judgment and ongoing review.

I would like to emphasize that Canadian carriers are paying international fuel prices only for marine fuel consumed in international transportation. Fuel consumed in travelling between Canadian destinations, which generally comprises the largest portion of fuel purchased in Canada by domestic carriers, will still be acquired at subsidized Canadian price levels. The application of international fuel prices on a non-discriminatory basis to both Canadian and foreign carriers is consistent with undertakings which Canada has with other countries and international organizations. In addition, it is reasonable to expect Canadian carriers to maximize efficient

fuel utilization and to pay international level fuel prices when competing with foreign carriers in international transportation markets.

Finally, there appears to be no evidence at present that the charge is causing serious damage to the economic position of the industry. Much of the reduced activity, which some in the marine industry have apparently ascribed to the TFCRC, is the result of changing market circumstances and slower economic growth. I am sure hon. members would agree. In addition, the administration of the charge has helped to ease the impact on the Canadian marine sector, for example—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary but the rules for adjournment motions are extremely strict. I cannot allow him more than three minutes as that would have to be subtracted from the time available to other members.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, in participating in the adjournment debate tonight I should like to say that a number of us on this side have, on a regular basis, put questions to the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan). I refer to the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) and the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) and myself. We have asked the Solicitor General to release the documentation RCMP defence counsel have requested, as it is essential for a fair and full trial of the 17 RCMP officers charged in the Quebec courts. I have pointed out that two former security service chiefs have indicated that they were pressured by the government to become involved in probing, by legal or illegal means, separatism in Quebec. The reason for the Solicitor General's refusal to release the documentation is simply a cover-up—the alleged cover-up for this government's illegal activities. It is alleged that the reason for the failure to release these papers is that the documents would shift the blame from the RCMP to Liberal politicians and bureaucrats. In addition, there are allegations that this documentation will be destroyed in order to make sure that Liberal politicians are never implicated.

Mr. Paul Jackson, who is the Ottawa correspondent for the *Edmonton Journal*, has put months of research into a lengthy article which appeared in that newspaper on February 4, 1982. I should like to commend him for his painstaking research that went into his story, which is the basis for my remarks this evening. He contends—and I agree—that the treatment the 17 officers are receiving from this government is shameful.

I hope the government will have the decency to release these papers, at least to the courts, so that these officers do not have to take the blame for the instructions they received from top Liberal politicians and bureaucrats.

Douglas Fisher of *The Toronto Sun* highlighted the story in an article of April 2, 1982, and paid tribute to Mr. Jackson for