12. Subsections (a), (b) and (c) are part of the conspiracy provision of the CIA, but have been omitted by me for simplicity; the omissions do not affect our discussion in any way.

13. See, for example, (Kheman and Stanbury, 1991).


15. This case, as well as all the others which were mentioned or cited was taken from a compilation of cases entitled List of Judgements in Relation to Combines Investigation Act (Ottawa University Faculty of Law) by the Hon. Hames Bowes Coyne, Court of Appeal of Manitoba.


17. Two other requirements used by Sproul (1993) are: (1) the predictor commodity must be sold under similar conditions of supply and demand, and (2) its price must not be significantly affected by an indictment affecting the price-fixed commodity. These requirements were not applied in this study simply because doing so would have virtually eliminated all the chosen predictors. Besides, Sproul indicates that the use of broad indices (such as those used in this study) mitigates the problem of correlation between the predictor prices and the prices of the price-fixed goods.

18. Notice that this period is approximately 4 years (same in all cases). Four years was decided upon as the cut-off point because some of the variables did not have enough data beyond that. Thus, 4 years was chosen to even the data for all the cases at the same time.

19. The first regression in each case represents the regression equation to determine the related variable with the highest $R^2$. This regression uses data before the conviction. The second equation, which uses data for the period after the conviction, has the chosen predictor commodity as its sole explanatory variable. The same equation (i.e., second equation) also represents the structure of the third regression run; unlike the second one, it combines both periods.

20. The following procedure was formally used to test the presence of autocorrelation in the Gypsum case. The same procedure was also used in the other cases.


