

Accordingly, it was decided not to proceed with Bill C-59, and in its place Bill C-70 was introduced in the other place.

Bill C-70 originally dealt with the enactment of the three provisions relating particularly to small business, including the section on misleading advertising, and it was found necessary to introduce a fourth provision in this particular bill which deals with the situation in the fishing industry in British Columbia.

Due to the fact that Bill C-70 did not receive second and third readings in the other place until today, it was decided to drop clauses 1, 2 and 3 from the bill, and pass only clause 4 which deals with the fishing industry in British Columbia.

In connection with clause 4 I think I should point out that the director under the Combines Investigation Act recently submitted to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and to various fish packing companies, associations and individuals in British Columbia a statement of evidence alleging that certain agreements and activities which were being carried on relating to the supply of raw fish by the fishermen to companies were illegal. As a result of the doubt that was thereby cast upon the legality of such agreements and activities, the fish canning companies declined to negotiate prices with the fishermen's union as they have done in past years, and it appeared that a strike might result which would lead to the loss of the salmon catch and perhaps other catches of fish.

In the present anti-combines legislation there is a provision to the effect that nothing therein shall be construed to apply to an organization of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees, and I understand that it is being argued by the fishermen that they come within the protection of this provision. If, however, it should turn out as a result of the inquiry that the agreements dealt with therein are not wholly or even in part legal, it may be that the report will disclose a situation which it will be necessary to take steps to deal with in a definitive manner. However, it is not possible to take these steps now. Therefore, clause 1 has been put into this bill and the effect of it is that the anti-combines legislation now in existence shall not apply to arrangements between fishermen or associations of fishermen in British Columbia and persons or associations of persons engaged in the buying or processing of fish in British Columbia with respect to the price, the remuneration or other conditions under which fish shall be caught and supplied between January 1, 1959 and December 31, 1960.

The latter date was chosen because it is hoped that by that time the remaining steps in the inquiry will have been completed and a report will have been made by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission; so that at that time, namely December 1960, one will be able to see what, if any, further action should be taken to eventually dispose of and clear up this particular situation.

Honourable senators, I realize that it is usual and customary to refer such bills to committee. In this case, with the leave of the Senate, I hope to have the third reading of the bill this evening. I am asking for this concession for two reasons. First, the bill is a very short one. It has only one clause, and I think I have given a full explanation of it. In the second place, I understand that we are drawing close to the end of this session of Parliament and if the bill goes to committee we will have to meet next week.

**Hon. John J. Connolly (Ottawa West):** Honourable senators, a full-dress debate on the Combines Investigation Act, and the amendments that had been originally proposed to it would be impossible in the short time at our disposal. I am not going to deliver myself of an oration on the iniquities of the Senate's receiving legislation at too late an hour in the session. I think this practice has been followed since the Senate was established, at the time of Confederation, and it is usual for people in opposition to stand in their places and refer to the iniquitous position in which the Senate is thereby placed. I suppose it is part of the procedure one can expect in Parliament.

As a member of an Opposition party, I do not make this plea to the members of the Government party opposite on political grounds, but I do make it from the point of view of this chamber itself. We are all anxious that this chamber work well, and we all have our responsibility to discharge our duties here as senators, whether we belong to the Government or to the Opposition. I believe that honourable gentlemen opposite are just as much concerned about their responsibility as are we on this side. During the few years I sat on the Government benches in this chamber I too felt concerned about our receiving important legislation at the end of the session; and I can still hear Senator Haig leading for the Opposition on this side saying the same thing. It is not a matter affecting one party or another, it is a matter affecting the Senate. It is a matter of the responsibility which every individual senator owes to this chamber and to the people of the country, to try to get the important legislation here in time to give it full consideration. I make that