

*Combines Investigation Act*

**Mr. Fulton:** I am simply saying that, based on what he said on Tuesday, I had thought that his amendment might suggest something similar to the fair trade laws in the United States; but it does not.

We were interested in this amendment moved by the C.C.F. party particularly for two reasons; and I am saying this admitting the full force and effect of what the hon. member has said, namely that if his amendment is defeated he still proposes to vote for the bill. Nevertheless it is obvious from reading his amendment, and I think it is obvious from what he has said himself, that he believes the bill should not be proceeded with until this concurrent legislation can be considered. But he has said that if the government rejects this suggestion of his, then he will support the bill. Therefore I think it is fair to say that the C.C.F. party agrees with us that the legislation should not be put through without an opportunity for further consideration; and particularly, from their point of view, without an opportunity of studying and considering the type of legislation that he and his party have in mind. And of course from our point of view we would like to study and consider the type of legislation which we have in mind as one answer to this problem. Therefore we both agree on the desirability of delay and further study and consideration of some alternative answer to the problem which has been considered.

Their amendment is, I believe, significant secondly because it indicates that the C.C.F. party also feel that the retailer is entitled to some form of protection, in that there is grave danger that he may be seriously prejudiced—I would go so far as to say irreparably damaged—by the legislation now before the house, if it is passed in its present form without any concurrent legislation. Therefore I believe I am right in saying that to the extent of the two points I have just mentioned, the C.C.F. party and ourselves are in agreement. But as the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Fairclough) has said, we cannot ourselves subscribe to a proposal which would involve the proposition of a system of price control, or of government control of retail or resale prices. It was because we saw in the amendment of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr the very definite indication that this interpretation would be correct that we felt we should make our own position clear by moving a further amendment to the amendment offered by the C.C.F. party. Our amendment preserves that portion of the C.C.F. amendment which says the bill should not now be proceeded with. I should like to make our amendment clear by reading what would be the whole motion if the original amendment of the C.C.F. party

were amended as we have suggested. If our amendment were adopted the amendment would then read as follows:

That Bill No. 36 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this house consideration should be given to the introduction of legislation providing for the establishment of a fair trade commission.

If the proposition is as I stated earlier, that the C.C.F. party is in agreement with us firstly that this legislation should not be put through without further consideration and, secondly, that the retailer is entitled to some protection, I am hopeful they will find it possible to support our amendment.

I should like to refer to some figures which were placed on the record this morning by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr as to the course and progress of this debate. He referred to the number of speakers in the debate and the length of time occupied. Well, I made my own calculation of this matter and I think, as a matter of fact, I make it slightly higher than he did. He said there were 26 speakers on the motion for the setting up of the committee. My calculation makes it 27, but I am not going to quarrel with him over one more or less. He said there were 29 speakers so far in this debate on the proposed legislation itself on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. I make it 30; but again I am not going to quarrel with him over one more or less.

**Mr. Knowles:** There have been two or three since.

**Mr. Fulton:** I am referring to the speakers up to the time the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr spoke. I would like to point out that actually the debate we should consider first is the debate now taking place on the bill, because although we did discuss the proposal to refer the MacQuarrie committee's report to the committee, we did not know what the legislation would be, did not know the form of it. I do not think it is quite fair to say there have been 30 plus 27 speakers taking part in this debate. I think it is more correct to say that there have been only 30 speakers taking part in this debate up until today. But even taking the two figures I should like to point out to you, sir, that during this session we debated the speech from the throne on 21 days. There were 187 speakers. During the course of the debate there were seven amendments and ten divisions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I do not see how that can have any relationship to the bill or to the subamendment.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, with respect, may I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that in the course of his remarks this morning the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr