

Competition Bill

denied a share of the market and who meets the other terms and regulations regarding conditions of sale. This is bound to create problems with other statutes and regulations and I am sure would work to the disadvantage of the consumer in the long run.

The section of Bill C-7 dealing with services demands that there be a period of time allowed for adequate consultation with the provinces. Some provinces have legislation covering the fees of some service groups. Some provinces have legislation pending. I believe that we should approach the matter of services in the fullest spirit of co-operation with the provinces so that the final regulations will meld or dovetail with provincial legislation, to the advantage both of those in the service field and those who use the services offered.

It seems to me that since coming to this House much of the legislation presented has had an underlying direction away from the courts or parliament, that it tends to endeavour to place quasi-judicial power in the hands of boards or commissions. I do not disagree that much of the technology of today is beyond the competence of the courts, and I do not find fault with this particular process provided the right of appeal is given to those persons who are the object of the rulings of a group such as the Restricted Trade Practices Commission. But I do object to legislation that in fact removes the power to act from the courts and from parliament.

There has been concern expressed by business groups across the country over the powers that will be given to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission to regulate Canadian business. These business groups, indeed any group or individual, must be given an opportunity to express their views and to request the exact terms of reference and powers to be given to the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. It is not enough to suggest, as some members of the NDP have suggested, that because Bill C-256 was discussed by the business community, enough representations have been made and that those representations should serve for Bill C-7. That is not consistent. I agree with my colleagues that adequate time must be given to allow for discussion of the bill and for representations to be made by the business community and the service industry as well as by professional sport.

Recently we had the example of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand) telling the House that under the Transport Act he cannot remedy certain situations because he does not have the power to act. We do not want another situation like that, and this is why I suggest a more cautious approach here so we are sure to cover the matter thoroughly.

We find reference in the bill to amateur sports, and I should like to read into the record a letter recently received from a constituent of mine that is typical of a number of letters that I have received on this subject. I know other members are going to speak about professional sports, but this is a letter that I received on March 14 last:

Dear Mr. Kempling: This is the first time that I have written my member of parliament about a subject which concerns me. Since this is a "first" in my 20 years of electing people to parliament, I trust that will indicate the degree of my concern.

I am most disturbed over the attitude taken by Mr. Lalonde towards the Toronto Northmen. Firstly, let me state without qualification that I am a supporter of the Canadian Football League and have been since I

[Mr. Kempling.]

first started regularly attending games in the late 1940s. I intend to continue this support even with a WFL team in Toronto.

What bothers me is having my freedom of choice legislated away. Giving people, by government law, only one choice whether it be football games, newspapers, beer or toothpaste is to me a very dangerous course to embark upon. The right to compete and offer an alternative product is basic to our way of life.

I am afraid I cannot accept this image of the CFL as being a great Canadian institution with 90 per cent of the coaches and general managers and 50 per cent of the players being American. The teams in the east are private enterprise situations and are in the "football business" with the hope of making a profit. Surely the Northmen are entitled to the same right.

If the CFL is going to survive, as I think it will, it must be on the basis of the calibre of their product and not the fact that they are a government backed monopoly. It is the right of the public to choose where they spend their sports/entertainment dollar.

Surely with unresolved problems like unemployment, inflation and welfare abuses, the government of Canada has more important issues to command their attention. The CFL is a great thing but not deserving of becoming a government protected monopoly if it is done at the expense of eliminating the personal right of choice of millions of southern Ontario citizens.

That is signed by my constituent, Mr. Jack G. Williams, and I think it expresses adequately my feelings on this matter.

I see my time is drawing to a close, so in the remaining 60 seconds I should like to say that another section of the bill that I am concerned about is the part dealing with the power of the commission to forbid foreign judgments or court orders directing Canadian subsidiaries away from export trade. I really do not think we are handling this in the right way. Quite frankly, I doubt whether the decision of a board or commission would have any effect on United States law. I do not believe this provision will be effective. I believe that this section of the bill has to be negotiated at the highest level in this country and in the United States before we can resolve the matter. With that remark, Mr. Speaker, I conclude.

• (1720)

Mr. H. T. Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-7 which we are debating today on second reading has the following rather cumbersome title:

An act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and to repeal an act to amend an act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code.

It seems more and more to be referred to as the consumer protection bill. I want to deal this afternoon with two particular aspects. Amendments in this bill are aimed at bringing improved benefits to consumers, small businessmen and to Canadians in general. The principal features of the bill include additional measures to deal with undesirable trade and advertising practices and the creation of a new civil function of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission enabling it to issue orders to modify or prohibit certain trade practices put before it, and provisions that would bring services in general under the legislation.

A major concern of the construction industry is that the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission will apparently have wide discretion in determining what acts or practices are to be entertained as complaints and considered prohibitive. There are very long standing trade practices and procedures in the construction industry which could