

Maritime Code

William to obtain a cheaper rate. The rail rates came down accordingly.

On behalf of farmers in the Atlantic area, I ask the Minister of Transport for assurance that the livestock industry in the Atlantic area and eastern Quebec will be monitored, that costs will not go up, that water competitive opportunities will remain for receivers and shippers of products related to the coastal areas of Canada. If there is to be an exception for British Columbia, as was suggested during debate, an equal opportunity for exception should be extended to the Atlantic area or any other area where it is required.

There have been estimates as to costs. It has been estimated that transportation costs of petroleum products from coastal refineries to central Canada would increase by 40 per cent as a result of implementation of this bill. I wonder if the minister could assure the House and the Atlantic refineries that such is not the case. If it is the case, could he give an assurance that Atlantic refineries will be protected, or that consumers of their products in the province of Quebec will be protected against increased transportation charges brought about by implementation of this bill?

Let me repeat what I said in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker. This is not an objection to a particular proposal of a maritime code; it is an objection to the fact that the bill involves only part of the total package. It has given no consideration whatsoever to the economic impact which might be pressed upon the coastal areas of Canada or even the lakehead areas of Canada. If it is brought into effect, it will impose hardships on the coastal areas against which other areas are protected. While feed grains may cost more in the Atlantic area, the Crowsnest pass rate remains in place. I do not quarrel with that, but I do quarrel with an increase in feed costs in the Atlantic area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired. We are at report stage on a motion before the House, not on the whole bill, and the hon. member has spoken for 20 minutes which is the time allotted to him.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have enough time for two more sentences.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I want to cite one more example. Since the opening of the Atlantic seaway there has been no change in rates, to the best of my knowledge and belief. There have been cost increases in the movement of ships through the mouth of the St. Lawrence, through the canal and into the lakes. I hope the Minister of Transport will assure the coastal areas of Canada that they will receive the same treatment as grain shippers in the prairies and those who receive service from the St. Lawrence Seaway and its connecting services.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, there was a discussion with respect to the form of the legislation that we are dealing with. Perhaps I should deal with that, and then the parliamentary secretary may have something to

[Mr. McCain.]

say about it. At page 59, lines 26 and 27, there is appended to the form of the bill as it came from committee the following words:

—described in the schedule to the National Capital Act.

My understanding is that these words were deleted or, as a result of the findings of the committee, were held to be unnecessary to the statement of the statute. I hope that before we finish debate today we can have the consent of the House to delete these words. I understand there is no difficulty with respect to that and perhaps we could deal with it later. I should like to say something about the amendment itself.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. We might as well clarify the point now, to make sure that everybody is satisfied with the guarantee. The matter was raised by two hon. members. I think we should proceed with motion No. 9 and the vote on the report stage motions that have been deferred. Then, before putting the question on third reading maybe the House could, by unanimous consent, make the suggested changes.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I agree in principle, but since third reading might not come today perhaps this could be done as a point of order just before we pass the motion for concurrence and report stage, rather than waiting for third reading.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I gather the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is acceptable to the government. It is acceptable to us, and I hope it is acceptable to the Chair. I should like now to turn to the amendment itself. As I started out to say, I want to commend the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) for this amendment. I support its intention.

On January 30, 1976, a motion was moved under Standing Order 43 condemning a surreptitious attempt to change the name of the capital city of Canada to the national capital region. That motion was turned down, of course. It had been proposed by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). The bill, as it went to committee, contained a legislative attempt to do exactly the same thing. At least it looked that way.

● (1610)

In terms of the motion under Standing Order 43, it generated one of the largest batches of mail from the Ottawa area that I have received as a member. Ottawa members on all sides of this House commented with respect to the national capital, what it is and what is its name. There was quite violent reaction to an exchange of correspondence between the clerk of the privy council and another with respect to the procedure that might be used to change the national capital. Quite frankly, it looked in the legislation as it went to committee as if this was being carried out. It may well have been the intention of the government to move step by step to gradually change the public thinking in terms of what is the capital city of this country. This is certainly one indication of an intention on the part of the government. I do not know what more we can find than a statement in legislation. Certainly, the way the National Capital Commission in this area has always