

set prices? It makes sense—but only because the government lacks the courage to bring in proper legislation to solve the problem.

We would not need much combines legislation if we promoted a good, competitive enterprise economy for which we are supposedly noted. The laws and the income tax provisions which this government impose upon the economy make it impossible for that to happen. Rather than give the corporations 9 per cent off the top, why not tell them that if they increase employment by 5 per cent, for instance, we will reduce the corporate tax by 1 per cent. Is this not the way to stimulate employment? Or we could say to the corporations that if they increased their export sales by 5 per cent, for instance, we would reduce the corporate tax by 1 per cent. These are the economic incentives that are necessary.

My hon. friend from Compton said that Canadians do not have the money to invest. I am sure the minister knows that Canadians have more savings per capita than people in any other country. The money is here and we should encourage its investment. We need investment in the country, and we would have it if we did what is necessary. We would not need negative legislation such as this. It has no positive qualities to recommend it.

The hon. member for Compton also mentioned taxes. The average Canadian is forced to pay a great deal through double taxation and interest rates. The minister does not seem to give a darn about this. We have a mortgage interest rate of 9¾ per cent. Why should we not provide some incentive to home owners by telling them they can deduct "X" number of dollars from their income tax payments. Then there is municipal taxation. We might put a limit on the amount that could be deducted, but if we allowed people to deduct, say \$500, for income tax purposes they would have more to invest in this country, and the more investment we have the less will be the need for legislation such as this.

When one reads a bill such as this it is discouraging to realize the time and effort that has been given to it by public servants to produce what essentially is negative legislation. I do not think it will accomplish what the minister has in mind. I am told he will present some amendments in a couple of years. I think we have all received letters from the tobacco and confectionery people pointing out that the minister has told them he contemplates introducing more legislation in two years' time. They were told that last year. Surely by now the minister has had an opportunity to think about this reintroduction of old legislation. If he is contemplating amendments, he has had sufficient time to introduce them.

Does the minister have to test the marketplace? It seems to be the practice of this government to have measures or programs tested without considering fully what they will achieve. I suggest that the government practices "Ad hockery night in Canada" day after day without applying any consistency or logic. I become annoyed about the way in which we handle the estimates. We can talk about combines, but let us consider what the government does. They wanted to take over the DeHavilland plant at a price of \$38 million. This item was sneaked through the other night. What opportunity did we have to consider the estimate in interim supply and see what is involved?

Competition Bill

When we ask questions about this, we are not given answers. We are not told about debts or liabilities. But the government wants members of parliament who are trying to be conscientious in representing our constituents to sanction the expenditure of \$38 million for the purchase of DeHavilland. The government had an option for two years. The option must be exercised by the end of June. Surely after two years the government should know what it wants to do.

● (1550)

But do we get the answers? No, they just want a blank cheque for \$38 million. To heck with the people of Canada, they are going to do what they want. This is what I object to. How can I go back to my constituents and say, "I am here to represent you, but \$38 million is going out the window; I do not know what for or what the benefit is to the people of Canada. This government refuses to tell me"? Talk about a combine investigation! It is this government that needs to be investigated.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Morgan: All I am trying to indicate to the government is that surely by now they could do a better job than this bill indicates. Surely they cannot deny the right of the people to take their case to the court of their choice. It is up to the Attorney General of Canada to decide, in the case of an indictment being preferred, if it goes to the Federal Court or not. It is his decision alone. Surely that is denying some of the rights of the people of Canada, and it is something this government said it would never do. That is how good their word is. They just do what they willy-nilly see fit to do. They do not provide any incentives. They do not attack the things that cause combines to occur. Their taxation policy invites combines. Surely the government could employ proper methods to combat this situation. If we were to help the small businessmen who cry out for help there would not be so much trouble with the multinationals. We should support the little guy in this country. This is not being done now. If it were, the minister would not need to introduce this bill; it would not be necessary. We are a nation of people with initiative and imagination. The government should use these qualities.

I do not like negative legislation and this bill is nothing but a bunch of negatives—thou shalt not; thou shalt not. Why do we not turn the coin over and make this legislation unnecessary? Let us not knock down the small businessman. That is what the government's policy is doing now; it is knocking the little guy out the window. Give him the economic drive that he needs and this legislation will not be necessary. Let us have the guts to face the facts of our economic situation. Who is controlling our economy these days? The multinationals and the labour unions. Let us accept that as a fact and go on from there. Let us start solving those problems. Then legislation such as this would not be required.

Mr. Frank Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I said in the House that what this government lacks is what we all crave, namely, a sense of unity and purpose. The people in the area I represent are looking for leadership. For example, we hear the minister saying transportation is a mess. We know