

provision was later amended after second thoughts by this second thoughts government.

● (1640)

Hon. members opposite say that the opposition has not had any ideas or recommendations to put forward. We are the ones who had the policy and have been pushing the policy of controls and decontrols. Days before the Minister of Finance stood up in the House yesterday and announced what he was going to introduce by way of amendments to deal with agreements which had been amended in line with the AIB recommendations, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), in a speech in Toronto, as well as in a speech in Montreal reported on Monday, June 13, which I am going to refer to, had stated what our policy was. He said that there were at least five items which his party would put into the decontrols program. The very first one is to respect judgments which have already been made by the Anti-Inflation Board limiting excessive wage or price increases. You can read that anyway you want, Mr. Speaker, but it comes to exactly what the minister said, namely, that agreements made outside the Anti-Inflation Board regulations would be required to be respected.

I cannot always expect the public to recognize what it is that the Leader of the Opposition says, particularly in my riding in British Columbia, because the article I am referring to was reported in the Vancouver *Sun* last Monday, June 13, on page 60. How can we expect anyone to understand what it is that the official opposition, which is trying in spite of the efforts of the government to save the economy of Canada—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): I thank the House for the enthusiastic applause.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are unanimous.

Mr. Nystrom: We are a party which is solidly unified.

I rise to participate in this debate in support of the motion put forward by the Conservative party to end this particular controls program on June 30 of this year. I happen to think that it should have been ended earlier. The reason I say that is that I am not opposed to controls per se but I am opposed to the very unfair and inequitable program brought down by the government.

I want to spend my few moments today talking about some of this unfairness in very specific terms. The leader of my party mentioned in his remarks yesterday some of the aspects of the controls program and some of the options that we would rather see. Hopefully on Monday someone else will deal with other aspects of the program. I want to deal with some of the specific unfairness of the program which is before us, particularly as it concerns increases in executive compensation or salaries.

One executive received an increase in his salary last year of 70 per cent namely \$60,363. It is an increase of that sort, Mr.

Anti-Inflation Act

Speaker, that makes this program very unfair. The same thing applies to company profits. We know that the salaries of workers have been held to increases of 8 per cent or 6 per cent. I have a list of about 50 companies with profit increases all higher than those allowed to the workers, the highest being 215 per cent. It is for reasons like that I oppose the anti-inflation legislation.

In commencing my remarks today I want to make it very clear that I am for controls, for a planned economy. But I am for one which is fair to everyone—workers, salary earners, profits, prices, bank interest and so on, one which will equally control all aspects of the economy. Unless we have that there should be no program at all. It must be fair to each and every one of us in society.

I should like to put on record some of the very unfair things which have been happening in this country since the controls program came into effect on October 15, 1975. First of all, ordinary working citizens are permitted a maximum salary increase of \$2,400 a year. I have a list here of 51 executives in 26 companies who have received salary increases higher than the \$2,400 limit and I think it would be worth-while to put some of these on the record.

The first company is McIntyre Mines Limited of Toronto. Mr. P. A. Crain their vice-president of operations, received a salary increase of \$25,488 in 1976—

An hon. Member: That is more than you made.

Mr. Nystrom: That is right. That represents an increase of 51.3 per cent. I am excluding the expense allowance and so on that other MP's get.

The second company is Bow Valley Industries Limited of Calgary, in beautiful Tory Alberta. The president of the company, D. K. Seaman, had a salary increase last year of \$35,000, or 70 per cent. B. J. Seaman, the vice-president, received a salary increase of \$26,000, or 51.9 per cent. Let us not forget that ordinary workers are held to an increase of \$2,400 under the law. Many of them cannot even get that. They have had their salary increases rolled back. Another vice-president of this company, D. R. Seaman, received a salary increase of \$19,000, or 46.3 per cent. Then a guy named J. R. Harris, senior vice-president in the same company, had a salary increase of \$20,000 last year, or 35.7 per cent. H. D. Binney, another senior vice-president, was treated really roughly; this guy only got a salary increase of \$9,333 or 22.4 per cent.

I now move on to the third company—and here I move out of Tory Alberta into Tory Ontario—the Van Der Hout Associates Limited of Toronto. John B. Van Der Hout, an officer of the company, last year received a salary increase of \$30,233, or 42.9 per cent.

The fourth company, also in Toronto, Rio Algom Mines Limited, gave the chairman of the company, Robert D. Armstrong, only a very small percentage increase, 3.5 per cent, but you will see in a moment, Mr. Speaker, why it was so small. His salary in 1975 was \$223,566. It went up to \$231,400, an increase