

Competition Tribunal Act

get by tapping the assets of Canada Trust for their own purposes, and not necessarily to protect the interests of the depositors in the Canada Trust company. Given that kind of objection by Members of his own caucus how can the Member stand up in the House and say that this Bill deals with the problems it is supposed to deal with.

● (1530)

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) is somewhat alarmed by the fact that Members of Parliament have the right to freedom of speech and should be able to express their opinions freely. That does not mean that their opinion is not debatable. I can understand the Hon. Member's comments, coming from the New Democratic Party. His Party will take a position which really involves a conscience issue and dictates that position so that everyone must toe the line. Therefore, I can understand why he is concerned about a Member of Parliament expressing an opinion that differs from the opinion of another Member.

I suggest that if he persists in delaying this legislation from moving forward to committee where we can hear from important witnesses such as small businessmen, small petroleum dealers, small grocers and consumer associations, then he is showing irresponsibility in his job as a Member of Parliament. If he intends to follow through with his threat in his speech this morning to oppose this legislation as long as he can, then I say he is irresponsible in his job as a Member of Parliament.

We want to get on with the job and see the Bill move forward so that we may hear responsible people at committee and develop a competition Bill that really means something. He knows as well as I do that there has only been one prosecution under the current legislation and there should have been a lot more.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I do not need lectures from that Member or any other Member about the way in which members of our Party arrive at conclusions and how they will vote. We have just as much freedom and have expressed those freedoms whenever there was a question of conscience.

I notice that the Member did not deal with my question at all. He did not indicate whether he agreed with the opinion expressed by Members in his own caucus.

Let me put another question to him. Brascan is a company which owns Noranda, among other corporations. Noranda owns mines, forest companies and so on. Does the Hon. Member not realize that when a company like Brascan controls Trilon, the decisions it will make for investment by Trilon may well be decisions which are good for the owners of Brascan but not good for the people who invest in the trust company controlled through Trilon? I am not saying they would make those decisions; I am putting the same question that was raised by the Canadian Bankers' Association.

Mr. Domm: The Hon. Member was in the House today and he knows that we have introduced not one but two pieces of legislation that would give us far more than we have now to deal with the situation he is raising. One of those pieces of legislation deals with financial institutions. We could either go before a tribunal and review the situation as we are proposing in Bill C-91 or we could give the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) the opportunity to react and decide on actions taken for controlling interest in other financial institutions.

We should get on with the job. I agree with what he says but I am sure he also agrees that we do not have anything now which allows us to deal with some of those matters the way we would like.

The Government is simply suggesting that if we can get on with this legislation and the legislation presented this morning by the Minister of State for Finance, we might be able to do more. Filibustering this Bill because everyone has not been heard will not solve any of the problems we have had for 75 years, nor does it deal with the fact that we have tried more than three times to introduce badly needed changes to the competition Act. The Hon. Member will recognize the need for those changes and we would like to get on with it. I am sure he will co-operate in the final analysis because he wants to do something about it.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary is aware that two main issues arise in relation to the legislation dealing with competition, the current Combines Investigation Act and the Bill presently before the House. First is the question of the restriction of competition and second is the question of concentration of power.

At present there are two cases of great concern relating to the concentration of power. One is the proposed takeover of Genstar by Imasco and the other is the proposed takeover of Hiram Walker Resources by Gulf. The Genstar and Imasco situation may very well be dealt with by the legislation introduced this morning by the Minister of State for Finance.

If the Bill before the House now is put in place with the terms provided for in the current legislation, will the Parliamentary Secretary state whether it will be effective in dealing with the concentration of power such as that in the proposed Gulf takeover of Hiram Walker Resources?

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, the intent in Bill C-91 is that the merger of two corporations totalling a value of \$500 million or more, where one of the companies being merged has a value of \$35 million or more, would be a notification to the Government that the merger could be investigated before the fact. The tribunal is being set up in order that we can do what is not possible now.

The Government requires pre-notification, and setting the size of the merger company at \$35 million—which is not a huge corporation—at least provides pre-notification and the opportunity to place the merger before the tribunal. We would