

*Canada Shipping Act*

Commission wrote to the Prime Minister in opposition to the unilateral charges being applied to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In addition, a coalition of Senators who represent Seaway or Great Lake states have written the Ambassador of Canada, complaining about the unilateral action that Canada has taken in Clause 4 of Bill C-75. They are the same Senators who were imposing tariffs on Canadian cedar shakes and shingles, the same Senators who nearly defeated free trade talks in the Senate Finance Committee. They are cynical about the Government's ability to deliver on free trade and are not much interested in free trade because they recognize that the Government of Canada cannot even deal effectively with the joint management of the Seaway Authority.

Those Senators who wrote Canada's Ambassador include Senator Alan J. Dixon, Senator John H. Glenn, Jr., Senator Levin, Senator Rudy Boschwitz, Senator Don Quayle, Senator William Proxmire, Senator David Durenberger, Senator Richard Lugar, Senator Bob Kasten, Senator Howard Metzenbaum and Senator Paul Simon. These Senators have taken the trouble to write the Prime Minister of Canada to express their amazement and shock that the Government of Canada, without consulting its partner in running the St. Lawrence Seaway, is about to impose a new set of user fees that will set up a two tier system on a Seaway that has been jointly managed by both nations for 30 years.

It is like Pavlov's dog in reverse. While Pavlov's dog was conditioned to go for a biscuit when a light flashed, Canada gives away another bargaining tool when the Americans impose a 35 per cent tariff on cedar shakes and shingles. That is Pavlov's experiment in reverse. The Government tells the Americans not to worry because it will not impose sanctions on any American products other than tea bags and oatmeal.

Yesterday, the United States brought down a unanimous ruling to seek to impose tariffs on our softwood lumber industry. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Côté) stood in the House to table a Bill to increase the cost of generic drugs in this country—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would ask the Hon. Member to be more relevant to the Bill.

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, the reason I gave this example is that on the one hand, the Government of Canada is destroying a 30 year old working relationship with the American administration on the joint management of the St. Lawrence Seaway, while, on the other hand, it is making a mess of the comprehensive free trade negotiations.

• (1610)

During the course of the day, because I am a Member of Parliament from Newfoundland, and because I wanted to be sure that I was not parochial in my address, I spent a great deal of time speaking of the impact of this Bill and Clause 4 on the St. Lawrence Seaway, on the Port of Montreal, on the Port of Thunder Bay, the impact on farmers in the Prairies, on

foresters in British Columbia, on miners in the Province of Quebec, on the Great Lakes—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize for interrupting the Hon. Member during his excellent speech.

I certainly don't want to criticize our interpreters whose performance in interpreting the Hon. Member's eloquence, word for word, is quite remarkable, but while listening to the French translation, I missed part of the Hon. Member's comments referring to the objections of people from Montreal who took part in the Montreal economic summit and who are also opposed to this Bill.

I therefore want to make it quite clear that in opposing this bill, the Hon. Member was also speaking on their behalf.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sure it is not the fault of the translators, either, that for some reason I find it difficult—

**Mr. Gauthier:** The interpreters.

**Mr. Speaker:** Or interpreters. I am sure that the point the Hon. member was raising became lost, as well.

**Mr. Gauthier:** It's the interpretation.

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, lest there be any doubt on whose behalf I am speaking, let me list the kinds of people on whose behalf I speak.

**An Hon. Member:** All Canadians.

**Mr. Tobin:** Yes, all Canadians. However, I find it strange that the Government has managed to make so many different kinds of people mad at the Government at the same time. Let us look at who is made at the Government because of Clause 4. It is an incredible array of diverse backgrounds and various interests all coming to the same conclusion.

The loneliest fisherman on the bill of Cape St. George on the southwest coast of Newfoundland is opposed to the Bill. The President of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the Bill. The potato farmer in P.E.I., who is producing potatoes at two cents a pound less than he is receiving when he goes to market, is opposed to the Bill. People along the northern part of New Brunswick, many of whom have harbours that need to be dredged regularly, are opposed to the Bill. People involved in the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association in Ontario are opposed to the Bill. The farmer who is on the Prairies, confronted with the lowest wheat prices he has had in 60 years and battling off a plague of grasshoppers, is opposed to the Bill. People in the Port of Thunder Bay, where 500 permanent jobs have already been lost, with the threat of the loss of 1,500 more permanent jobs, are opposed to the Bill. In the great Province of Alberta, those people in the forest industry, to the extent it exists, knowing they must get their product to the market through the Great Lakes, are opposed to the Bill. The people who are employed in