

whole industry. I refer, of course, to General Motors. Let's not kid the troops; there is no competition in terms of price. It is a question of price leadership. The only competition, and it is certainly minor competition, exists in the registered outlets of each of the large manufacturing corporations. When you say you will lower tariffs and allow in foreign goods to increase competition you are talking balderdash and nonsense. We cannot dismantle our industrial enterprises just because the prices don't fall low enough. We must make sure that our large manufacturers are protected in a sense. So, prices will never be lowered by reduction in tariffs or removal of customs barriers. It is nonsense to suggest that they will. These large organizations set prices and set the terms, and they are never really prosecuted because they combine. If they are threatened they find a way out. They have always avoided prosecution in the past and they will in the future. The bill before us does not solve anything with respect to prices.

The measure before us deals with the banking industry. What an industry! Does anybody honestly suggest that there is real competition in the banking industry, other, perhaps, than in the advertizing campaigns they run on television, or over the radio or, perhaps, in terms of their fancy buildings, claiming that one tower is a little higher than another, or in terms of the personality of one manager as compared with the personality of another? Is there any competition in the interest rates charged by banks? We all know that the prime rate of interest is 9½ per cent and we know that credit risks are adjudged by all bankers in basically the same fashion.

● (1620)

Every small businessman knows that when he goes to one bank and is refused he will probably be refused at another bank. This bill does not get at this situation at all. So far as the banks are concerned, all the bill does is to levy a fine of \$10,000 as an alternative to the possibility of two years in jail, and whoever heard of a banker going to jail under the last act? Is a banker going to jail or is he going to pay a fine under this act? So, let us not kid ourselves: the provisions of this bill with respect to banks are meaningless in terms of competition, and why they are in the bill I do not know. This bill is not a bill that is going to improve competition in banking in any way.

So far as the oil industry is concerned, just last fall we had what was supposed to be an oil crisis. The price of gasoline increased by an almost identical amount at the same time at the pump of every oil company. There is no question of combine here; it is a question of an oligarchy when that type of activity occurs. The approach of the government is the wrong approach. The government is not doing anything about increased prices or about these oligarchies.

What we really need is an incomes and prices review board. What we really need is an incomes policy based on the long term that will put public input into our price and wage structure. In a country like Canada, with 22 million people, we must maintain the economy of scale that the large corporations provide. But recognizing that, we must also recognize that competition is not going to control prices, that public input must be made.

### *Competition Bill*

For a long time we have recognized that to control telephone rates and transportation rates, the rate that is charged must be reviewed by a public board or commission. This is what this party has been saying all along in regard to inflation and price control. Essentially, we have been saying that what we need is an incomes policy that is absolute. We need to attack inflation in a different fashion. Simply tinkering around with provisions dealing with refusal to sell and other little things in this bill will not do very much to benefit the consumer. The hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Atkey) was right when he asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) today: Where in this bill is there anything to reduce prices? This is the issue today, yet there is nothing in the bill whatsoever to reduce prices. The bill may have some good points, but really it is a bankrupt bill.

As I say, there are some good things in the bill which we would be most pleased to support and are very happy about, but with regard to the over-all concept of reducing prices and controlling the economy so that the big and powerful do not, to use the words of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), rip-off the people of Canada, we must have an incomes policy that will control prices and wages in the public interest. Then the large fixers of society will not be able each and every year to take a larger and larger share of the total pot. This is what has been happening in the 1970's, and it will continue to happen since this bill is not going to do anything to stop it. It might do something to control arrangements made between two automobile dealers, but it really is not going to do anything to control the fixes in society. It is about time the government and their allies started to realize that this is the 1970's, the last half of the 20th century. The economic philosophy of the 18th or 19th century does not apply today. This is not 1930.

I should like to say a few things about what the bill does. It has some accomplishments that are valid and for which we have been calling from time to time. The bill creates offences for certain shady business practices, and certainly these shady business practices must be controlled. The bill restricts bid rigging, where one contractor combines with another contractor to put in a fixed, high priced bid. It controls that sort of thing, and that is important.

The bill controls misleading advertising. It controls phony warranties, and I think we are all in favour of that. It controls some aspects of double ticketing. It has provisions in regard to advertising and in regard to some of this alleged bargain advertising. This is the situation where someone advertises what is said to be a bargain, but unfortunately he does not have enough goods in stock to meet his anticipated orders and he is really using his advertisement of a bargain as a method of switch selling. The bill does control this type of activity. The bill controls pyramid selling. It controls some of the phony contests that are carried out by some firms through advertising of merchandise.

All of these are items of consumer protection, and if they were included together within one bill and put before the House as one proposition, then we would have a worth-while piece of legislation, a piece of legislation that members on this side would, I am sure, accept almost