

Combines Investigation Act

point very well, but I did not intend to suggest to the minister that I was asking the government to interfere in any way with the operations of the restrictive trade practices commission. To put it plainly, what I was asking the minister was this, that if it turned out that the law did prohibit collective agreements, would the minister take the view that that would be a good law to maintain? Because we would not.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, Mr. Chairman, the act is quite clear on the point. If it were the fact that this was only an ordinary agreement of the kind we are discussing, then obviously section 4 would apply and would have its full operation. But we are told that this is not this type of agreement; otherwise presumably the matter would have been resolved long before this, and might never have been started.

Mr. Ryan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the minister has indicated that the government has serious reasons for wanting to obtain a result from this litigation before dealing finally with this matter. My personal opinion is that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre is being wise and practical in this matter and not at all irresponsible, as was indicated by hon. members in the far corner.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say one or two words in this connection, with particular reference to the remarks just made by the hon. member for Fraser Valley. I am in the same position as he finds himself in, having been away from the sittings of this house for some time, but I am sure that he will recall, as I do, that the subject matter under discussion resulting from the introduction this afternoon of this amendment to the bill is not new. In fact, it certainly was a matter which was initiated and which received considerable discussion during the time when both he and I were members of this house at a previous parliament.

I am rather surprised that there should be any hesitation on his part in expressing agreement that this matter should be brought to an end. I recall very well having urged on the government of the day when this matter first came forward the proposition that the intent of the combines act was certainly not one which should involve the fishermen of British Columbia in this sort of thing. I recall very well having urged upon a friend of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillington who was then minister of fisheries that he should see to it that the government of that day should take immediate action if legislation were necessary to clarify the position of our fishermen. Now both the hon. member for

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Fraser Valley and myself find ourselves back in this house again, and this matter is, in effect, still where it was at the time when a former member for Coast-Capilano was minister of fisheries, and our fishermen are still essentially in the same position. For that reason I cannot see why the hon. member for Fraser Valley, or indeed any other hon. member of this house, should hesitate at this time to take action which will permanently clarify the position of the fishermen of British Columbia.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement made by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, I should like to say that I, like he, am still in agreement with the principle. I did not give any intimation that I was opposed to the principle; in fact, I made it abundantly clear that I was in favour of it. I had just made the observation that, in view of the statements which have been made this afternoon and the circumstances existing at the present time relevant to the ramifications, it would perhaps be advisable to go along with this extension so that this matter could be cleared up and then the whole problem could be resolved.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 9; nays, 141.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, I shall ask my colleague the Minister of Labour to move the following amendment:

That clause 1 of Bill C-49 be amended by striking out the figure "63" in line 21 and substituting therefor the figure "64".

This amendment will have the effect of extending the effect of the amendment until December 31, 1964.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Minister of Labour has not moved it.

Mr. Starr: I so move.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1 as amended agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Mr. Pickersgill: Next sitting of the house. The government might wish to filibuster it.