

Combines Investigation Act

denied to the C.C.F. and, as my friend from Essex East says, to the Liberal party as well.

Mr. Morton: May I remind—

Mr. Howard: We wrote a letter to Mr. Gilbert and he refused to answer, refused to send this information and it only came out incidentally.

Mr. Morton: Is it not true that there were only certain members of the Conservative party who had access to that document and, as others pointed out in the committee, they did not have it either.

Mr. Howard: I do not know who in the Conservative party had this document. Some very strange things occur within the Conservative party, especially in caucus meetings. I did not know that this was one of them.

Another point I should like to mention is that in this particular submission, which is misdirected to the steering committee of the Department of Trade and Commerce—

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Howard: Yes.

Mr. Pickersgill: Is the hon. member really sure that was misdirected?

Mr. Howard: I was just about to say that. I did not know that the Tory caucus now ran the Department of Trade and Commerce, nor was I aware that politics had become so powerful in this government.

Mr. Aiken: Now you are getting into nonsense again.

Mr. Howard: I will tell you something about the nonsense in this particular document, misnamed or otherwise. The statistics in it are incomplete. This Mr. Gilbert attempted to take some statistics from the dominion bureau of statistics and some from Dun & Bradstreet. He took his cue from the Canadian Electrical Manufacturers Association presentation to the restrictive trade practices commission in 1954 when they used Dun & Bradstreet figures.

In any event there were some things missing from this presentation. There were references made to appendices A, B, C, D and E. In the document which was presented there was appendix A and appendix B, but there was no appendix C nor was there any appendix D. The hon. member for Port Arthur, who was in the committee, pretty well ruined Mr. Gilbert's approach to the

statistics by pointing out that they did not mean anything. Then he said, as reported on page 139:

There is one other question which bothers me in this connection.

The hon. member read a sentence from the brief in which there was a reference to appendix D, and then he said:

Now, appendix D is not in this.

He was referring to this particular trade and commerce Conservative party submission or whatever it is. Mr. Gilbert said:

That is unfortunate. It is in most of the copies. However, some of those were assembled in a hurry, and that might explain it.

I was one of the fortunate ones or unfortunate, because when Mr. Gilbert made reference to this document that had been presented to the Tory caucus, misnamed or otherwise, I went to see Mr. Gilbert who gave me a copy of it and indicated that copies would be mailed to each member of the committee. I received a copy in the mail and when I looked through it I found appendix D was still missing and so was appendix C. These are important parts of the brief because reference is made to them. If a brief is to be submitted that is incomplete and contains statistical information which paints an incorrect picture, if Mr. Gilbert is denied the right, by the Tory majority on that committee, to reappear before the committee and answer some of these questions, then I do not see that we should pay too much attention to the representations of Mr. Gilbert or the retail merchants association, especially when he threatened members of that committee in a tone and in a manner which was not conducive to the best of feelings between the members of the committee and the witness.

I should like to make some comments, if I may, on the remarks of the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska, to which I listened with interest. He dealt with the oil industry and the pulp and paper industry and related some difficult circumstances which had developed because of the activities of the oil industry, that their secret deals, as I believe he called them, on prices had allowed the large consumer to benefit to the detriment of the small consumer. In dealing with the pulp and paper industry he indicated, I took it, that perhaps they were doing something which was not beneficial to the small pulp and paper cutters and people in that industry.

Then the hon. member went on to say that he supported the bill because it would allow proceedings to be undertaken and investigations to be prompted and promoted which would deal with this sort of thing. I assume