

be willing to make available a copy of this brief as an appendix to the minutes and evidence of the committee today.

Hon. Mr. GREGG: Well I would have no objection, Mr. Chairman, but I should like to say that the organization mentioned did do a very great deal of work in this matter and in the memorandum or brief that you mention now as No. 2. Last year their officials came down, in addition to Mr. Rigby I believe Mr. Stevens was the spokesman—and we were at the early stages of this thing and they spent all of a day, or more, in discussion with my officials here, and later, at my request, Mr. Murchison consulted with them when he was in Vancouver, and their views were gone into very very carefully.

By the time of course the March 4 memorandum had arrived, progress had been made; but I did refer, when I wrote to the author in my acknowledgement, to the inter-departmental committees that were then working on this matter. I think it is right to state that in their first plan, and also it is reported now, of course, in their second one, that there are—and correct me if I am wrong—things which could have been carried out if the plan had been devoted exclusively to the Pacific coast. Naturally, however, they prepared their submission for the Pacific coast.

Mr. BARNETT: That is right.

Hon. Mr. GREGG: I think we all understand the point of view as seen from that part of the industry. But I do not think we would want to have this scheme applying to one part of the fishing areas of Canada and to have the commission do, what in fact they toyed with doing, of having one set-up for the Pacific coast and a completely different one for the Atlantic coast, and maybe a combination of the two for the inland areas. I think that would have led to jealousies and misunderstandings and condemnations. I feel quite sure that the things about which the organization feels very strongly and which are incorporated in the brief are those things which actually could not be carried out because of the universality of the plan. I might ask what is the number of the type-written pages of the brief to which you have referred?

Mr. BARNETT: How many pages?

Hon. Mr. GREGG: Yes, I mean how big a printing job is it?

Mr. JOHNSTON (*Bow River*): It is very large.

Hon. Mr. GREGG: I am very glad to acknowledge the cooperation they gave and the work that they did on it, and I do feel it might be at this stage an unnecessary expense unless the committee insisted upon it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (*Bow River*): Well I think the same purpose would be served if they would send us each a copy of the brief.

The CHAIRMAN: Well after the explanation which the minister has just given, I do think I should say that this was not presented to the committee, it was not addressed or forwarded to the chairman of the committee and I do not think it would be proper to have it included as an appendix to the minutes now. I am, of course, in the hands of the committee.

Mr. BARNETT: I understand, and that is not a suggestion that I would be making in respect to many of the briefs that do come to our attention from time to time, but I feel that this one represents a more than usually carefully prepared submission on a subject that we all agree is pretty complicated.

Furthermore there are one or two points which I should like to raise in connection with it and I felt that if it were incorporated as part of the record, I might be able to condense my questioning a little. However, if it is not considered appropriate to do this and if the committee is not prepared to concur in the agreement of the minister that he would make it available, I think I