

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Did you report to your Minister after that inquiry in writing?

Mr. MCGREGOR: I am required under the Act to report in writing at the conclusion of every inquiry.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Every preliminary inquiry?

Mr. MCGREGOR: No, every inquiry.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I gather from what you say there is no dividing line between the preliminary and the main inquiry.

Mr. MCGREGOR: There has not been.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: What took place afterwards if you reported there was matter for further inquiry?

Mr. MCGREGOR: Then it was the Governor in Council decided whether they would appoint the Commissioner to proceed with the further inquiry.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: We will assume it is very serious all the way through. I am still anxious to know how you proceed. Suppose you go right on with it, what do you do after the preliminary inquiry?

Mr. MCGREGOR: We would apply to the Minister of Justice for counsel to assist the Commissioner or the registrar in the inquiry. That is what we have done in the Coal case of 1932-33. We asked the Minister of Justice to appoint counsel, we asked the Governor in Council to authorize the appointment of accountants, and then we held the more formal hearings, at which all the evidence was taken under oath.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: You ask for certain documents and you get them. Then you are going to seize more documents?

Mr. MCGREGOR: If we find there are other documents that we believe contain information which relates to the alleged combine, we call upon them to produce the documents.

Hon. Mr. MORAUD: In some cases don't you seize the documents right off?

Mr. MCGREGOR: We have asked for the documents. None of our representatives has ever gone in and seized them. We have asked that they be produced.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Are you conducting the Patent case investigation in the West?

Mr. MCGREGOR: No. I believe the complaint was made to the Trade and Industry Commission.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Suppose it has been proven that a very large corporation is a combine to the detriment of the public.

Mr. MCGREGOR: Proven, you mean, to the satisfaction of the registrar?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: No, it is not proven to the registrar.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Suppose it is proven to be a combine to the detriment of the public, and the corporation is fined \$100,000?

Mr. MCGREGOR: Not under the amendment.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: What is the penalty, then?

Mr. MCGREGOR: \$10,000 is the maximum penalty for an individual. It can be anything from \$10,000 down to \$1. In some cases it was \$100, in others \$1,000. For a company the maximum is \$25,000 in the Act as it is at present.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Does that include the directors? I am thinking of Senators Dandurand and myself. The other Act took in the directors too, because they were blamed for having a knowledge of the combine. Are they still included?