

tion of new powers and the establishment of new governmental monsters which will have to be considered in comparison with the value and usefulness which otherwise appear in the legislation. And there will have to be some valid equivalent before such bills are acceptable to me. I would suggest that others in the House and outside it should do the same. I particularly direct my attention to many of those involved in big business and industry. I refer to them because many of them are opposed to this bill, but for different reasons than mine.

It is a common sight to see hundreds of leaders of industry and business hiking down here, briefcase in hand, to push and prod government into programs and policies which make them the beneficiaries of government hand-outs. It does not sit too well with me to hear these people, in face of this record, complain about aid being given to those who really need assistance. It weakens their complaint in respect of this legislation. You and I, Mr. Speaker, know the legal motto that he who comes into court must come with clean hands, and he who seeks equity must do equity.

Everywhere we detect cynicism and distrust of the processes of government. It is interesting that in the morning edition of one of our newspapers there are two articles dealing with this in both Europe and Canada. People note that the gap between promise and performance, in respect of the present government in particular, is wider than the Grand Canyon. The so-called remedies for our social and economic problems which are sought by men at the top level of government are always the same—power, authority and secrecy. This government has lost its credibility.

There is rot, and the sour stink of decay is apparent around the corridors of power in Ottawa, just as it is in other capitals. These are the facts uppermost in my mind when asked to support this bill which gives so little and demands so much, and which persuade me not to vote for the measure.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, it has been said that this is a bill that will give some small degree of assistance, and allow this or any future government to take some action on behalf of the consumers. This competition bill, if it does anything, will provide some of the means whereby the interests of consumers can be protected, if the government so wishes. That is the assumption, but it may be that the assumption can be called into question even at this point in time. Perhaps we are in the same position as nations going to war. Historians point out that nations have often gone to war using the weapons of the last war, which very quickly were shown to be obsolete. Much money had been spent developing them while an enemy country was in the forefront of the development of more modern death dealing weapons.

A quite significant statement was made in this House recently by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand), and made in a befuddled way. It was not surprising that he was befuddled because he had to admit he had a department over which he did not have control, that he was running a transportation system but did not know how it worked, and that the system had failed but he did not know why. One positive statement he made was that competition no longer existed in the transportation indus-

Competition Bill

try. That industry is pretty big in Canada, covering ground, air and water, and when the minister said competition does not exist in it he was merely stating the obvious.

At one point in time there was a controlling body governing rail rates. Then, the provinces gave franchises to truckers. Certain firms were given the exclusive right to go over certain highways and serve certain communities. The amount of load the trucks can carry on the highways may be different in each jurisdiction, and there is bargaining over rates within provinces. The air traveller, whether he uses Air Canada, CPA or Nordair also finds that competition just does not exist any more.

This morning the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) said he had a new dairy policy. All it really amounts to is the provision of new rates of subsidy, different from existing rates. If the costs, and the price to consumers are set by government fiat, by government direction, we must ask ourselves how much competition exists in that industry. If you want to go further than that and consider the wholesale and retail level then, when one co-operative in the province controls 80 per cent of the sales of industrial milk and when one multinational corporation can control 60 per cent of the product, how much real competition exists in that part of the food industry? If this is the case in important sectors of the economy, then how are we going to control the price of certain foods or services to the consumer by pretending that competition exists or that by some device it can be forced to exist?

● (1450)

The minister in charge of the Wheat Board has been juggling the feed grains industry for years now. There is a secret document floating around that no one knows anything about—except all the major grain companies, the National Farmers Union, the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, the Farmers Union in Quebec and many others. Apparently the document proposes to put the Canadian Livestock Feed Board in control of the forwarding of grain. It is going to have complete control of the movement of feed grains, but at the same time they are proposing to open the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange. I suggest they are labouring under a delusion because you cannot have controls and the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange or any other exchange dealing with the same product. You must do one thing or the other. If you do both you get the worst of both worlds, and it is mainly the producer who suffers.

It is not what this competition bill proposes to do that bothers me or the manner in which it is proposed. What bothers me is that we have the minister and the government trying to deal with competition without recognizing how the real world operates, while the ordinary consumer is getting gouged.

In an article which appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* of January 15, 1974 under a Montreal dateline appears the following statement:

Crown Prosecutor Bruno J. Pateras said Monday that three of eastern Canada's largest sugar refineries overcharged their customers an estimated \$125 million between 1960 and 1973.

Even if this competition bill had been passed, this could easily have happened. Eventually, somebody might try to