

If we talk about standards, about making sure there is no shoddy workmanship, then certainly we can set standards. We do this in connection with weights and measures. There is very little of the type of heavy thumb on the butcher's scale activity left in this country. We can force standards to be adopted. We have done so in the electrical industry. Standards should be enforced. We should have a better Canada Corporations Act. Now the government gives us this *pièce de résistance* to really show this is a wonderful piece of legislation, right up to the minute, and shows how this piece of extraterritoriality came in with the Worthington company. They say, "We are going to put that into the combines legislation package to show you what a well-rounded, beautifully developed thing it is." Except for one thing—it doesn't belong here: it belongs in the Canada Corporations Act, where you can clearly say that no director of a Canadian company shall act against the laws of Canada. And, if he does, he cannot be a director of a company. Why fool around with this matter in the combines legislation?

Also, we should go further with the corporations act. Those of my party who have had a chance to look at the corporations act have argued time and time again not only for this kind of a measure but for full disclosure. How are you going to know anything if you do not in fact have full disclosure? It is true we are getting more disclosure in our society, but we are not getting as much as is required in order for us to make decisions. Rather than give us a good corporations act, something which would really protect the public, we get a little bit of it thrown into the combines legislation and the corporations act goes on in its unrepentant way.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, if the government wants to say to this House that this is all they can do at this time, make a few minor changes and adjustments, as long as they are sufficiently humble about it and bring the legislation before the House in an attitude of humility and admit it is an insignificant measure which makes a couple of minor corrections, I will go along with it. I will respond to the bill in kindness and say to the minister that he has not come up with much, but that it is something. But I hope the government has no illusions that by bringing in this piece of legislation it has accomplished anything worth while for the Canadian people or has made any significant correction in what is essentially a bad market situation.

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking on this bill, primarily because I think the minister did justice to the bill in his speech, as did his parliamentary secretary. The measure was introduced in the last parliament and is being repeated at this time. I think the Canadian public, and certainly small businessmen and the press, have had an opportunity to digest what is covered in the measure before us.

We just heard from the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman). He uses about eight different approaches when making speeches, and I think the one we heard tonight was what he calls his "pooh-pooh" speech. When he finds a bill as good as this one which is difficult to attack, one which has won wide acceptance in Canada in all segments of the business community and from consumers, it ill behooves him to attack the bill and cut it to pieces, so what we have is the hon. member delivering to

us his "pooh-pooh" speech. His approach is: It is not a bad bill. It does a few good things, but it is really not all that significant.

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear or see the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) jump up and down, or pound his desk and scream that this was the greatest piece of legislation the government had ever introduced. I think it speaks well for the bill when it indicates this and nothing more. It is not a new bill; it is an amendment to a piece of legislation, and the amendments it contains bring important benefits to consumers, to small businessmen and to Canadians in general. The government had earlier announced its intention to bring in a new competition policy, to bring it forward in stages, and this bill represents the first of these stages.

The principal features of the bill before us include additional measures to deal with undesirable trade and advertising practices, the creation of a new, civil function for the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission which will enable it to issue orders to modify or prohibit trade practices brought before it, and provisions which will bring services in general under the legislation. That is what the bill attempts to do. To hear some members opposite comment on the bill, particularly hon. gentlemen in the far left corner of the House, one would get the impression that illegalities are rampant across the country, that Canadian businessmen are engaging in the kind of practices this bill is introduced to prevent.

Only a very small segment of Canadian businessmen and markets would be affected by this legislation in any event, because its provisions will apply only to very few of them. I took issue the other day with some hon. members who have a tendency to give Canadian business a black eye. I think the marketplace in Canada is probably as honest as any in the world. Mr. Speaker, you cannot legislate honesty, but I think you have an obligation, when someone does something which is contrary to what is fair in the marketplace, to bring in legislation to catch that particular irregularity.

Opposition members would be jumping to their feet, no matter what provisions the bill contained, if no machinery was provided to restrict unfair practices in the marketplace. They would be criticizing the government for failing to bring in measures to control pyramid selling, and so on. When corporations engage in illegalities, means should be provided for dealing with them; and in cases where the consumer is hurt, some redress should be forthcoming, as is provided in this bill.

As one who practised law for a few years, I remember dealing on all too many occasions with people who had signed promissory notes at the end of long contracts. They found the note had been assigned, usually to a finance company. The finance company sued for payment. The answer was, for example, that the cutlery had not been delivered, or it was not aluminum, it was tin, or whatever it was. There was no particular defence. No legislation existed to cover such a situation. There was no protection for the consumer. It is the obligation of provincial legislatures to afford protection in instances of this kind.

This party, this government, brought forward legislation to protect those who were on the short end of a bill of exchange where they really had no defence. We have an