

which continue to drain off all our top talents without contributing to the Canadian amateur organizations which have invested their time and money in developing these athletes. I would now suggest that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare get together to decide which of their two diametrically opposing views are in fact party policy.

In closing, may I state that I will support this bill in principle for passage to the committee stage, but I can assure members of the House that I will insist in committee on having the presently ambiguous sections enlarged in such a way as to ensure that the competition act truly means fair competition and provides an opportunity for Canadian youth to continue the development of amateur sport in this country.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the introduction of this bill for second reading with a certain lack of enthusiasm. In fact, what this bill really does is to allow my friends on the right and my friends across the chamber to continue to indulge in the myth-making process that in fact we live in a free enterprise system. They will put on a little lipstick, comb their hair and say: the system is just a little out of joint now, so what we can do is to bring in a competition act and then we will have prices set by competition. I challenge any member of either the Tory or the Liberal party to find me a reputable economist who will say that prices in North America, and particularly Canada, are set by competition. In fact, prices have long been set in this country by administration. This is the term used by Galbraith. They are administered prices.

I welcome this cosmetic piece of legislation because in some areas there may be some abuses we can catch. But in fact most of the prices of the major products in this country are set by administration, either through government regulation or on the 18th hole of the golf course. Those are the facts of life and there is no way in which we can avoid them. So it is a wonderful theory that both the government and the Official Opposition operate under, but it does not bear any economic examination or evaluation.

I must say that in terms of what the minister is trying to accomplish with the bill, some of these provisions are good. I certainly welcome the effort in regard to controlling referred selling, bait and switch procedures, double ticketing, and selling above the advertised price. These are all provisions that can help the market cosmetically, but they will not help in a major way because, as I said, most of the major prices in this country are set either by government regulation or by administration. What we really need is a minister with will, energy, courage and determination to make the bill effective because, after all, we have had the Combines Investigation Act for some time.

Perhaps we should examine the record under the old legislation. The old act has long provided, for example, for jail terms of a maximum of two years for certain offences. How many people in this chamber can recall anyone who has ever gone to jail as a result of a conviction under the Combines Investigation Act? I cannot recall a single incident, and yet the board of directors of the General Electric Company in the United States some years ago faced a jail

Competition Bill

term. Why have we not had jail terms imposed in this country? Is the offence of conspiring to raise the price of a major product to any consumer in the market place any less serious than a first offence of breaking and entering, which sometimes carries with it a jail term, or a second offence for possession of marijuana? At one time we were jailing people for six months for a first offence for possession of marijuana.

We have a Restrictive Trade Practices Commission on which the minister has seen fit to have only one member, a person we can only call an acting chairman, not a full time chairman. On the basis of the old legislation, in 1970 and 1971 that branch only used 41 per cent of its budget. In 1971-72, it used 61 per cent of its budget, and in 1972-73 again it only used 61 per cent of the budget. That does not indicate to me that the government is really interested in controlling monopoly pricing or in truly attacking this problem. What we need is not just more legislation along this line. We need a minister and a government with the will, energy and dedication to make this competition legislation work, at least to the limited extent that it can.

Now, I should like to come back to the major theme of my remarks. The legislation can only work to a limited extent in the kind of economy in which we exist. Certainly, I welcome the clause dealing with the imposition of a foreign law on Canadian firms. I think this is something that has been long overdue, and it is particularly apropos in terms of the recent MLW Worthington case. But I have to point out that the only time such cases really come to our attention is when somebody on a board of directors decides: "To hell with this; I will blow the whistle". That is usually when we find out about it.

What I ask is: how many companies in this country which are dominated or are subsidiaries of foreign corporations have, in fact, refused to bid in foreign markets such as Cuba, or any other countries that are on the U.S. enemies list? There could be many indeed. This legislation will not solve that problem. The only way we will solve that kind of problem is to repatriate the economy, but that will be a long and tough struggle. We must promulgate the foreign takeover review legislation. Mr. Speaker, I have a list in front of me of 13 foreign takeovers that have taken place in the major industrial sectors since that legislation was passed by the House and received Royal Assent. If the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) wishes to solve one of the problems that this bill seeks to solve, namely, the imposition of foreign law upon the Canadian economy which prevents us from dealing with certain nations, then let him promulgate the foreign takeover legislation and publish the guidelines. Ultimately, that is the only way in which we can tackle the problem.

● (1700)

As I say, the provision in this bill which attempts to deal with the imposition of foreign law on the Canadian economy is merely cosmetic. With the major part of our economy foreign owned, it is obvious that many foreign-controlled corporations are not seeking markets in certain other countries. I am convinced that many opportunities could be found in the Chinese market if our corporations made the effort. I am interested in the amendment which purports to provide a right of action to individuals who suffer as the result of conspiracy. This is in proposed new