

Combines Investigation Act

I submit that if such a large group of people in Canada have come to this conclusion after a very detailed study, more detailed than has been given to this measure, then we should tread lightly in destroying a similar practice in the general merchandising field in this country. I know the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) is quite familiar with this trend in the marketing of agricultural products.

I am sure that this house will await with interest an explanation from him as to how this practice can be so good in one case and so detrimental in another, as his colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson), would have us believe.

In closing I should like to give one note of warning to hon. members who may be still inclined to support this measure. If the government persists in placing this ill-considered, hasty and far-reaching legislation on the statute books of this country they will by their action sow the seeds that will eventually destroy the whole basis upon which the marketing of agricultural products and the stability of agricultural prices are presently being maintained.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Fulton) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson	Drew
Aylesworth	Fairclough, Mrs.
Balcer	Fraser
Blair	Fulton
Cardiff	Graydon
Casselman	Hees
Charlton	Hodgson
Churchill	Lennard
Courtemanche	Macdonnell (Greenwood)
Coyle	McGregor
Dinsdale	Nowlan—22.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson	Darroch
Argue	Dechene
Arsenault	Dion
Balcom	Dube
Black (Chateauguay- Huntingdon-Laprairie)	Dumas
Blackmore	Eyre
Blanchette	Fournier (Hull)
Boisvert	Fournier (Maisonneuve- Rosemont)
Boivin	Fulford
Boucher	Garson
Breton	Gauthier (Portneuf)
Bryce	Gingras
Cameron	Gour (Russell)
Cauchon	Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Claxton	Healy
Cleaver	Helme
Coldwell	Henry
Corry	Herridge
Cote (Matapedia-Matane)	Hosking
Cote (St. Jean-Iberville- Napierville)	Howe
Cote (Verdun-La Salle)	Jones
	Jutras

Kirk (Digby-Yarmouth)	Monette
Knowles	Mutch
LaCroix	Noseworthy
Lafontaine	Pearson
Laing	Proudfoot
Langlois (Gaspé)	Prudham
Leduc	Rinfret
Lesage	Robinson
Little	Rooney
Low	St. Laurent
Macdonald (Edmonton East)	Sinnott
MacNaught	Stuart (Charlotte)
McCann	Studer
McDonald (Parry Sound- Muskoka)	Tremblay
McIlraith	Ward
McLean (Huron-Perth)	Whiteside
Major	Whitman
Maltais	Winkler
Masse	Winters
	Wood—82.

Mr. Gardiner: I was paired with the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. Gibson: I was paired with the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Brown). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. White (Middlesex East): I was paired with the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. McCubbin). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. Browne (St. John's West): I was paired with the hon. member for Yukon-Mackenzie River (Mr. Simmons). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. Catherwood: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Huffman). Had I voted, I certainly would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar): I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we are to attend at the other place for royal assent to certain bills, but I believe I shall be able to finish what I have to say before we leave this chamber. The debate on this particular matter really began on November 2, and was continued on November 6. At that stage there were twenty-six speeches. The problem went to a special committee of the house which heard eight hundred pages of evidence. Finally, a report was made to this house on December 7. The debate on the bill which came to us as a result of the committee's deliberations began on December 17, continued on the 18th and 19th. There were twenty-nine speeches, three of them over two hours in length. Yesterday, of course, we had a debate on procedure when thirty-six speeches were made, and an inferential debate continued on the measure still under discussion. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel there is very much need for me to say a great deal about the amendment I propose to move at