Transportation

quid pro quo, and show the hon. gentleman how co-operative we are, the committee might like to clear up at least one of the clauses which has been allowed to stand—the amendment to clause 20 and to clause 20A. I should like to speak briefly in answer to points the minister made. As far as I know, no one else has any intention of speaking at any length on the matter.

Mr. Pickersgill: I must say it would be helpful if there were a general disposition to dispose quickly of clause 20 to which an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Port Arthur, and with regard to which I myself have a small amendment to offer in the light of the observations made by hon. members, in particular by the hon. member for Acadia. It would also be most convenient if we could dispose of the proposed clause 20A.

The Chairman: Before the committee proceeds to decide what it will do with clause 20, it might be wise to decide what it wishes to do with clause 42.

Mr. Pickersgill: I understood we had agreed to allow clause 42, with the amendment of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, to stand until the beginning of proceedings tomorrow. It was further agreed to revert now to the amendment of the hon. member for Port Arthur.

The Chairman: It is this agreement I should like to confirm. The suggestion is that clause 42 stand, with the understanding that when the committee resumes its work tomorrow clause 42 will be the first item to be discussed. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Is it the wish of the committee to revert now to clause 20?

Mr. Pickersgill: To the amendment of the hon. member for Port Arthur. Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for Port Arthur moved his amendment the other evening the hon. member for Acadia raised a point which concerned me. One or two other members spoke about it; I believe the hon. member for York South said something about it. The point was the relation of this amendment to the Combines Investigation Act. I felt that even though some thought had been given to this matter by my advisers, further consideration was desirable.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

I am able to advise the committee that the officials of the combines investigation branch are altogether in favour of the purpose and objective of this amendment, which they feel is precisely along the lines of their own legislation, but they believe it will be improved if in the second paragraph, where it says the commission shall give or cause to be given such public or other notice of any proposed acquisition referred to in subsection (1) as appears to be reasonable in the circumstances, the words were added "including the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act".

This would enable the director under that act to intervene in the hearings if he felt there was any reason for doing so. It was also thought it would be desirable, in order to make sure that there could not possibly be any interference with any action which might be taken under the Combines Investigation Act, that instead of the commission giving its approval in these cases it be given the power to disallow.

• (8:40 p.m.)

In other words, instead of giving a positive approval the commission could say "disallow", and so far as I can see in that way any possible conflict between the two would be totally removed. Instead of my asking one of my colleagues to move a subamendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Port Arthur, I wonder whether the hon. member for Port Arthur, if the committee allowed him, would substitute this proposed amendment for the one originally offered?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Chairman, I am most agreeable to that suggestion.

The Chairman: Does the committee give its unanimous consent for the hon. member for Port Arthur to withdraw his amendment to clause 20?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: And to have substituted therefore the new amendment as read by the Minister of Transport.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Chairman, I shall only take a minute on this because we have already expressed our interest in the desirability of the amendment. I would point out that it was the hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Acadia