

to the committee to deal with the government's amendments. I would not be interested in giving unanimous consent if the bill was to be locked away in the committee. I do not want to see the bill referred to the committee and killed—because that could happen unless we are pretty careful.

I would hope that the amendments to be referred back to the committee would not be there for a long time. I do not see why that would be necessary, although I agree they require careful examination because they are not simple amendments. The consideration of the committee should be restricted to those amendments and should not include the entire bill. I hope, when we are giving consideration to the terms under which the bill would be referred to the committee, those terms do not include a general reference but merely a specific reference related to the amendments.

That being the case, I hope this House will see that the bill is reported back expeditiously, given third reading and passed, so that at long last we can give effect to the very worth-while, useful and intensive investigation carried out by Mr. Justice Darling on the coastal trade and so we can create a new industry for Canadians, some new employment and do something useful for the country in terms of nationalism as well.

Mr. Goodale: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a question asked by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) in connection with copies of the amendments which the minister indicated to the House earlier would be available. I now have copies of the amendments for members who may wish to look at them during the course of this afternoon.

Mr. McCain: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I presume these amendments will be distributed to all members who are here. If, by any chance, a copy of the speech is available, it would be nice to have it as well. The minister made a statement in his speech which indicated there was agreement among the transport ministers of Canada, Atlantic and federal, in respect of the principle of the bill. Was that meeting held after May 25 and 26, when the premiers met and expressed some objection to the bill?

Mr. Goodale: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, first of all, with regard to the copies of the amendments, I have made copies available to the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and I believe he will ensure that members of the official opposition will have copies available to them. Other copies are available at my desk for members who may not have them. Second, in connection with the minister's reference to discussions with the ministers of transport from the Atlantic provinces, I am not aware of the precise answer to the hon. gentleman's question, but I will determine that information for him later this afternoon.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to join my colleagues who have spoken in expressing my concern over the fact that this bill is before the House today. There is no question in anyone's mind that the bill was not to be brought in before the recess of parliament. There were very specific reasons for this when we negotiated with the government to have the bill withdrawn from debate in the House of Commons

until the fall. The minister, of course, enumerated these reasons. The first was that this would not provide sufficient time for consideration of the bill or its implications.

● (1610)

The minister is not surprised that there is further objection to this bill, and that is why he indicated today that he might be prepared to refer the bill back to committee. Of course, he knows exactly why. On the surface this looks like a very innocent bill. When we consider the geographic make-up of our great land, it is our natural desire to establish a maritime industry. We are surrounded by three oceans. We want to establish industry in our country to put the thousands of unemployed to work and to give us a greater variety of options with regard to self-determination.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) said that a maritime code would be essential for the development of our Arctic resources, but at the same time he said that if we had a Canadian maritime industry, it would cost more. Is not cost exactly the component which is hindering the development of our frontier reserves? The hon. member proclaims that additional costs should be added. The whole thing does not make sense. There has not been a cost analysis of this bill; the minister knows that very well. Industrial expansion must obviously be our aim, but it should be attuned to our areas and industries of greatest potential. In the opinion of my colleagues on this side of the House, the expansion of the maritime industry at this stage of the game, particularly when we are working with significant advantages as a result of not having artificial barriers, is not in the greatest interest of any industrial expansion today.

We are asking ourselves: Why Bill C-61 at this time? The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) says that this bill is a filler which he wants to get through today. It is poor planning that he should be caught like that at this stage. This has been the longest session in parliamentary history, and the minister brings in a bill of this magnitude to get it through as a filler. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) was somewhat less than honest when he proclaimed in the House today that there has been general agreement between industry and governments throughout our country, particularly on the west and east coasts. He is even less honest when he says that he has the agreement of east and west coast officials. I would like to quote from a letter the minister wrote to the minister of transport in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. Goodale: That is a hopeless case.

Mr. Oberle: The Minister of Transport to whom the letter is addressed sat across the House from us and received support for years, and now he turns out to be a hopeless case. The reason he is not sitting across the House from us is probably quite apparent, because people on the west and east coasts are sick and tired of the way this government deals with our industry and transportation system. In his letter to the minister of transport of British Columbia, the minister said:

General satisfaction and acceptance of the proposed legislation have been clearly indicated at these meetings by the provincial officials, including the representatives of your Department, subject only to the