

of commerce, in public hearing, the publicity connected with the public examination of the cold facts would perhaps have more effective results than even a decision in a law court, which may be carried through the various courts to the privy council, a procedure which sometimes occupies several years before it is brought to a conclusion; whereas in the other case almost immediate results would be achieved.

I may say to the Prime Minister that I am not at all desirous of reflecting upon the excellence of his work during past years in connection with this class of legislation, but I think that by again putting this matter under the administration of a commissioner we are taking a retrograde step which will not in any sense meet the demands of modern business or effectively control the intricate and very often far-reaching problems which are prevalent in the commercial and industrial world.

Mr. BENNETT: Why does the minister find it necessary to make a change in the existing condition? The statute passed in 1935 placed the administration of the act in the hands of a commission. The Dominion Trade and Industry Commission was appointed in accordance with the recommendations made to this parliament by the price spreads committee. The administration of the combines act was placed in the hands of this commission, and appropriate amendments were made to the legislation. This commission has done some good work. Since I came back to Canada I have found evidence of communications which have been made to the commission. I find that numerous inquiries have been made about various matters and steps taken which brought about the proper adjustment of more cases than one. Why should not the Dominion Trade and Industry Commission continue to function in the manner provided for by the statute, without the creation of a new and expensive board?

The former commissioner is still acting and we would have the benefit of a trained legal mind. The minister knows as well as I that as business has progressed the main complaint to-day is against unfair competition. This is one of the matters engaging the attention of economists everywhere. How can we overcome unfair competition as distinguished from a combine pure and simple? Why is it necessary to set up a body separate and distinct from this other organization in connection with which you would have the benefit of a highly trained legal mind as against an untrained mind whose curiosity and desire to ferret out things for any purpose becomes no longer a merit but a fault? After all, this country must compete with all countries of the world if it is to maintain its export

business. We have to maintain a decent standard of living and by the supervision now provided by the statute to which I have just referred we have endeavoured to prevent what might be called cut-throat competition which might result in the creation of a monopoly far worse than any possible combine. This has been one of the most marked changes during the last fifteen years.

I suppose the minister has read what Adams described so clearly as the cause of our present condition. He referred to the creation of corporations, holding companies and matters of that sort. But leaving that out for the moment, you have the fact that cut-throat competition is an evil which nations are endeavouring to combat. This must be done to prevent a monopoly being created in a single business. Without going into details, which might be regarded as unfair, I think it can be said that we have had cut-throat competition in this country which resulted in the establishment of monopolies. The minister has been a student of these things and he must know to what I refer. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) referred to some of them. If the minister wants to know just who they are I can give him a list.

Mr. DUPUIS: We should like to have a list from the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think I will gratify my hon. friend's curiosity.

Mr. DUPUIS: We want to see how it compares with ours.

Mr. BENNETT: If he will take the trouble to look up the books himself, he can find out who they are. They were referred to in this house on one occasion many years ago. A change has been brought about by unfair methods of competition. One only needs to read the economic history of the United States to discover how powerful enterprises have acted in different communities. We may have three people in business in a community and a large enterprise wants to buy them out. They offer very good prices, sometimes more than the business is worth. However, sometimes the proprietors reply that they do not want to sell, that it is a family business. They are told that the corporation is coming in anyway and if the unfortunate people do not sell they are squeezed out of existence. That is the condition with which we are faced to-day. That cannot be called a combine because there is only one company in the business. Through the elimination of competition they have become a monopoly. They have not increased prices in every case, but their profits have been increased through the elimination of wasteful competition.