

royalty, particularly on new oil, by 65 per cent on all oil over \$3.80 a barrel. I ask him whether he and other members of the oil industry were happy with that result.

Mr. Bawden: Mr. Speaker, I would respond to that by saying that at the time of the March 28 accord, at which point in time these higher Alberta royalties were in effect, the industry, the federal government and the Alberta government all went back after the news of the accord had been made known with the feeling and the conclusion that they could in fact operate under those rules.

I will have a further chance in committee to respond to what the minister said in opening debate on the bill, when he had a lot of criticism of the premiers and quite a bit to say about the fact that the Prime Minister had not deceived the premiers at the time of the March 28 accord. However, after the March 28 meeting, the industry, the provinces and the government, as well as people of Canada, thought that an agreement had been reached that was a lasting one.

When we get into the clause by clause study I should like to respond to some of the remarks the minister has made, because it was when the Minister of Finance in May pulled the rug out from under the industry and the provinces that the whole ball game changed. From the period following March 28 prior to the May 8 budget, everyone was satisfied to get on with the job.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I have only about 30 seconds, I should like to call it five o'clock and pursue my speech tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, pursuant to special order made Tuesday, February 4, 1975, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

It is my understanding that the House would be ready to proceed directly with Bill C-226, appearing in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) and accordingly stand all other items appearing ahead of this item. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

TRANSPORT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH COMMISSION OF INQUIRY TO INVESTIGATE ACCIDENTS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East) moved that Bill C-226, to provide for the constitution of a federal transport commission of inquiry (impartial investigation of transport accidents), be read the second time and

Transport Accidents

referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak again on this matter. As a result of some conversations held through the usual sources on the other side of the House and, if I can get the concurrence I am about to suggest, with the unanimous consent of the House, I would ask leave to withdraw this particular bill in favour of having its subject matter referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. If the government is agreeable, I will also move to withdraw from the order paper notice of motion No. 17 standing in my name, which repeats in the appropriate form and in detail the explanation of this bill. I do so inasmuch as this item was first introduced in Bill C-66. It has been on the order paper as Bill C-85, Bill C-33, Bill C-109 and, now, Bill C-226. The House will be aware, therefore, that this matter has been debated and discussed at some length. However, I am quite prepared to withdraw my bill and notice of motion if the government will agree to referral of the subject matter to the standing committee for consideration.

• (1700)

I think there will be agreement to do this inasmuch as the general subject matter of this bill has been accepted in principle by the government and was dealt with in the most recent throne speech. With the leave of the Chair, and if the government is agreeable, I would be prepared to withdraw those motions.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that there have been discussions along the lines indicated by the hon. member who has just spoken. Certainly we are prepared to go along with the proposition that the subject matter of the bill and of the resolution be referred to the appropriate standing committee. Even so, we would like to have some discussion on the matter. My fear is that if the House simply agrees at this moment to what the hon. member is asking for, that will be the end of it. What should happen, I think, is that the hon. member should speak on this bill for a few minutes, let one or two others speak, and let it be understood that at the end of the debate, whether it is 20 or 40 minutes from now, the bill and the resolution will be discharged and the subject matter referred to the committee.

Let me repeat, in summary, that we agree to what is being proposed but we think that before that happens there should be a few words said by different members of the House on the matter.

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). As I understand it, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) has asked for leave to withdraw his bill and has also moved a motion that we refer the subject matter of the bill to the standing committee. That motion is certainly debatable, as I understand it.

Mr. Forrestall: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have not moved a motion. I ask for the unani-