

Shipping

There being no item under the heading of private bills on the order paper, the House will now proceed to notices of motions (papers).

Mr. Lefebvre: On a point of order, I believe there is agreement that we continue the debate on notice of motion for papers No. 22 in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) with respect to which there are 44 minutes left. I understand there is some feeling that this debate could be shortened and that a vote could take place. We might also go on with notice of motion for papers No. 21 standing in the name of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) with respect to which there are 11 minutes left. Perhaps we could vote on that motion also before 6 p.m.

● (1700)

Mr. Forrestall: Madam Speaker, on the point of order that is being raised, I think there is general agreement and that there is a disposition not to have a recorded vote on the order standing in my name. This will depend upon what the parliamentary secretary will say to me within the next few minutes, but I think we can accommodate him on the point raised.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On the point of order, Madam Speaker, we have been in on these discussions and we would agree with what has been proposed. We would like to have a recorded vote on the motion in the name of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

Mr. Lefebvre: Madam Speaker, due to difficulties that have been encountered electrically in ringing the bells, would it be agreeable that the discussion on the first motion, No. 22, terminate at 5.30 to give us time to ring the bells and get the members in for the second?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Not later than 5.30. It might be earlier.

Mr. Lefebvre: Yes, not later than 5.30.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Before proceeding to notice of motion No. 22, shall notices of motions Nos. 17 and 24 be allowed to stand and retain their place?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

The House resumed, from Thursday, March 6, debate on the motion of Mr. Forrestall:

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of all studies, notes, position paper, memoranda, etc., relating to the requirements of

Canadian shipping with respect to the proposed formula for import/export conference rated seaborne trade, in terms of the number of ships required, the capacity of Canadian shipyards, the number of Canadian merchant seamen required, the level of ancillary shipyard related industries of design capability, etc., in the event Canada ratifies the proposed code of Conduct for liner conferences.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I am privileged to be able to continue my intervention on this resolution. In doing so I should like to update some statistics that I placed on the record when I began my remarks a month ago.

In the first column on page 3858 of *Hansard* for March 6, when this debate began, I gave figures indicating the drop in the strength of the Canadian merchant marine from 1946 to 1972. The last figures I had then—figures provided by the Canadian Transport Commission, official government figures—indicated that in 1946 there were 203 dry cargo merchant vessels in the Canadian deep sea trade flying the Canadian flag. These vessels were over 10,000 tons. In 1958 the Department of Transport had to reduce the measure from 10,000 tons, because there were not very many by that time, to 3,000 tons in order to have an entry in their statistics. At that time there were five vessels, only three of which were over 10,000 tons, the others being between 3,000 and 10,000 tons.

In 1968 the total was down to three vessels over 3,000 tons. Then in 1972, again in order to have an entry in the tabulation, the measure had to drop from 3,000 tons to 1,000 tons, so as to give at least some indication of the strength. In December, 1972 it was indicated that there were six vessels over 1,000 tons, four of which were dry cargo vessels and two tankers. Two years later the report, again from exactly the same source, on the basis of the measure of 1,000 gross tons dry cargo vessels, shows the number down to three.

This is evidence, if any is wanted, of the lack of interest of this government, despite its protestations, in the regeneration and revitalization of the merchant marine. If this is not a sign of complete neglect, of a decision to bypass completely this very important service for Canada as an international trader, first of all, as well as an employer, as basically a maritime nation with—I think I am right—the longest coastline in the world, I do not know what is. Yet we have a merchant marine at the end of 1974 consisting of three vessels over 1,000 tons. Their total tonnage is 13,010 tons, not much bigger, in fact I think ten tons larger, than a Liberty ship. Here is a record of complete and utter neglect.

Last month we were delighted to see a press release issued by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) indicating some activity in the field of ship repair and shipbuilding on the east and west coasts. This is beginning to be, to my way of thinking, a chronic reaction by the government to present problems: issue a press release and the problem will go away. The minister spoke of a floating dock in Vancouver, and I am going to deal only with the west coast. Unfortunately I do not have a copy of the Minister's press release with me, but as I say he spoke of a floating dry dock in Vancouver harbour and indicated that funds had been allocated for this purpose amounting to about \$30 million, though I stand to be corrected.