

Competition Bill

possible to grow. That is the way to build a strong country, with energetic people ready to do anything. Men who have something to do, who own something, are not concerned about their own business only, but with social affairs and the business of others. Those men work in any field. They spend a lot of time and energy to help others and develop the economy of their province, their city, their country.

Mr. Speaker, we shall build a strong country with owners and not only with tenants. We do not need a stable government but strong industrialists to have a stable economy. We do not need a stable government that sits there on its hands, doing nothing. A stable economy is the work of prosperous industries and businesses, of men interested in developing them. Those were the remarks I wanted to make and which might help find some solutions. Our solutions are not miraculous, but reasonable and acceptable to all Canadians because they are logical and complete.

[*English*]

Mr. Trevor Morgan (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, when you read a fairly lengthy bill like this you sometimes become a little discouraged about what it is attempting to do. You become a little lyrical at times.

The minister of corporate affairs,
Comes to this House and he dares,
To present us a bill,
Like a sugar-coated pill,
Like Trudeau—as nobody cares.

This is what gets to you, that no one in the government really cares what happens to the people of this country. The government thinks this bill is going to solve the problems facing the people of Canada. Let me deal with two specific features, one of which is procedural and I think is a disaster, and the other the substantive part of this bill. In respect of the procedural aspect, I say to the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in Canadian jurisprudence we are taking away the function of the criminal courts and giving it to the Federal Court. The government guaranteed the people of Canada some time ago that this would never happen. It said, in effect, not to worry; no criminal jurisdiction would ever be given to the Federal Court.

Look at what has happened in respect of sections 32, 35, 36, 38 and 46 of the act. I suggest that demonstrates criminal jurisdiction being implanted in the Federal Court. This is a serious incursion into the civil rights and liberties of the people of Canada, because the Federal Court has its own rules, regulations and procedures and, in addition, its own rules of evidence. I suggest this is the thin edge of the wedge. This government continues, in its arrogant way, to put more and more criminal jurisdiction and arrogant power into that court where so many of the fundamental rights contained in the British system of justice are denied. I suggest this must be stopped and it must be stopped now.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) was asked, apparently, for an opinion by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) on whether it was proper to do this. He was asked at the committee the other day whether he gave his sanction and he replied in the affirmative. He was asked for his reason and he said we should ask the

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I have not heard during this debate any good reason why it should be done. If the minister is conscientious in his job, perhaps before the debate is concluded he will tell us why, for the first time in the jurisprudence of any Commonwealth country—certainly for the first time in Canada—a government has taken upon itself to set up its own court, transferring common law and criminal jurisdiction to the Federal Court. And, as I have said, the government promised last year, when this court was set up, that this would never happen.

● (1540)

What are we to expect? The government says one thing and does another. It is about time the people of Canada were alerted to the fact that what this government says one day does not mean a thing the next day. The government does just what it wants to do in its arrogance.

What does this bill really do? Does it deal with the problems of the multinational corporations? The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) gave many statistics in this regard. He made an excellent speech. His points were well taken and I shall not repeat what he said. However, what must we come to grips with? This is a negative bill: it does not attack the problems and tell us what we should do.

Let us look at the power of the multinational corporations. The minister knows as well as I do that most of them have more power than him. What does the bill do to improve that situation or to help the small businessman? It does nothing. What does it do in respect of the situation in some labour unions? They must also be considered multinational corporations. I speak for myself in this matter and perhaps not for my party. I think we must incorporate the labour unions because they can be as guilty of infringing fair bargaining practices as many national corporations. Why does the government not have the guts to incorporate the labour unions so that they will sit at the bargaining table as one incorporated company dealing with another incorporated company, so that both sides can sue or be sued and both will have responsible national officers who know what their type of business is all about.

Let us take the next logical step. We could set up a labour court composed of leaders and people who are sufficiently competent in the field to solve these problems. Our country is infested with strikes, fights and lock-outs; people say they do not care what the law says and they will do what they want in any event. What can we do while provincial legislatures and this parliament sit idly by and do nothing? I say that this government obviously is afraid to take a strong stand on this question. Surely some imagination exists in the minds of people on the other side, but so far we have not seen evidence of it.

This is a very lengthy bill. It is a negative bill. There are very few positive qualities to recommend it. If we gave the business community some economic incentive, we would not need this bill because the problem would solve itself. Consider what this government has done with regard to the extractive industries. The foreign-owned corporations receive a much better deal than Canadians from an income tax point of view. So why should they not get together and