

*Government Orders*

I certainly consent to the minister having the opportunity to move the motion now.

**Mr. Marchi:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the motion is to send the bill the Standing Committee on Transport rather than to a legislative committee. Members from all sides on that committee have had a good discussion and there seems to be unanimity on the committee so we have no problem with that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The House has heard the motion. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** It is the motion to refer.

**Mr. Brewin:** What I wish to do is to put on the record the views of the New Democratic Party on second reading.

I heard you asking the House whether it agrees to the motion.

**Some hon. members:** No, no.

**Mr. Brewin:** Just relax over there. If I have your permission, Mr. Speaker, may I proceed on second reading?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I think there is a problem of comprehension or translation. The motion is not to agree to the main motion but to modify the main motion to transfer clause-by-clause study to the Standing Committee on Transport.

• (1610)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is there unanimous consent for the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I failed to understand the way in which the motion was put. I think we now have it all sorted out. We are now proceeding with second reading, and it is agreed that after second reading this motion will ultimately go to the

standing committee rather than to a legislative committee. That is what we have just agreed to.

This last little contretemps was a procedural matter. I would like to state on behalf of the New Democratic Party our basic support for Bill C-33.

However we do have some concerns about the bill which we will generally be addressing at the committee stage. I would like to set out our reasons for supporting this bill and also indicate why in our view this bill is a relatively minuscule step to deal with the problem which it seeks to address, and that is the condition of the shipbuilding industry in Canada. This is a most modest step for the government to be taking. The shipbuilding industry deserves far more. It is a very important industry to Canada which this government and preceding Liberal governments have failed.

In clause 3 the bill states that:

—no foreign ship or non-duty paid ship shall, except under and in accordance with a licence, engage in the coasting trade.

That is to say trade on the coasts of Canada. The coasting trade is a technical term which is defined in the act. On the face of it this is fine. However it provides for a set of exceptions and it is those exceptions which we will want to review very carefully.

In his remarks on the bill the minister referred to one exception and that concerns cruise ships. The example he gave of a trip from Vancouver to Alaska and back to Vancouver is a helpful example and one with which we would agree. However there are many other similar cruise ship visits which we want to be assured will be dealt with properly in this bill.

For example, as the member for Victoria I am familiar with cruise ships from the American coast which stop in Victoria and/or Vancouver on their way to Alaska. Are those cruises exempt? If not, what is the significance of this bill for the cruise industry, which is a very vital industry for the Victoria region and B.C. in general? We will want to examine that question.

The concept of requiring licences, in other words taxes and duties to be paid by foreign ships using Canadian waters, is in itself valuable. As I suggested it does not go far enough. It is a minuscule step in the effort to do something for the shipbuilding industry in Canada.