

In nearly all cases, if not in all cases, they are usually people of substantial means in their own right. They do not accept lieutenant governor appointments as a way of making a good living, and it would be an insult to any lieutenant governor even to suggest that. That is not why they accept the honour of such an appointment. Most of them, as I say, if not all, are already of substantial means and standing in the community.

The government is suggesting a 12 per cent increase, or \$2,400, whichever is the lesser, per year in order to show restraint. If this is applied to lower income people, then I submit 12 per cent is too high for people of high income. A 6 per cent increase for judges, MPs and lieutenant governors, in real dollar terms, is as much or more than a 12 per cent increase would be for someone earning between \$8,000 and \$12,000, such as a steelworker in the city of Regina. Surely that apportionment is fair.

For many years I have objected—I am critical of the trade union movement in this regard as well—to the continual percentage increases, across the board, that have been made which mean that the spread between low incomes and high incomes becomes even wider. It is high time that the trade union movement started to bargain for their members in terms of cents per hour or dollars per week or per month, rather than in terms of percentage spread.

It seems to me it is even more incumbent upon parliament and the business community, when arranging the salaries and expenses, prerequisites and prerogatives of their executives, judges, lieutenant governors, members of parliament and senators—people already in the high income brackets—to say that if 12 per cent is enough for an \$8,000 to \$10,000 a year steelworker, then 4 per cent is more than enough for the vice-president of the steel company. But no, he will get the same increase as the low income earners in his own company. We are seeing increases that are in excess, in terms of total dollars, of what is seemly and fair compared to what the overwhelming number of Canadians have to live on.

We have been saying for some years that restraint has to come about in many forms. We have been pleading for a prices and incomes review board that has teeth and the backing of this parliament as well as the confidence of the people of this country. Then any increase in professional fees or prices of steel products or other major commodities would have to be submitted to the board and justified. Any increases they could not justify would not be allowed, and any increases in excess of what could be justified would be rolled back. We have to be fair: any modest increase that could be justified or proven necessary would be allowed.

● (1220)

I am sure that if the board had that kind of authority and the backing of this parliament, it would also have the confidence and the trust of the people of Canada. Instead of that, we have a board that has no power and no authority; it is limited to food prices only. The way the government set up this board ruined a good idea because the government went only part way.

We have been urging a fair tax system because the low and middle income people of this country are still paying a

### *Salaries Act*

disproportionate share of the tax bill. In comparison with the high salaried people and corporations, the low and middle income people are still carrying the greatest portion of the tax load of this country. We have an unfair tax system. Surely this is an area in which we could show some restraint so that those who need should get, instead of those who have been getting it all.

We have been urging a two-price system in respect of many commodities. If a two-price system is logical and proper for wheat and oil, and we in this party think it is, it is equally logical and proper in respect of all other grains, lumber, steel products, chemicals, fertilizers, farm machinery and trucks. Instead of that, we are telling our low and middle income people to show restraint, and we are requiring them to pay phony international prices that bear no relationship whatsoever to the cost of producing the product and moving it to their homes.

Until about a year and a half ago we were paying unrealistically high prices for lumber products, not because it cost that much to produce the lumber in British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec, but because those were the prices industry could get on the international market. The Canadian consumer was stuck with the same international price. Why should we have a two-price system just for wheat and oil? If we want to reduce the demand for increased wages and salaries by many Canadians, we must do something about what it costs them to obtain a decent home. There must be a program of selective controls on basic industry. We must not only have a two-price system in respect of basic commodities but we must have selective controls, and I think again of steel and forest products.

The Liberals and Tories talk about the fight against inflation, but when they come out with proposals like those in bills C-44, C-47 and C-24, to me this is just talk and nothing else. When the economy gets really bad, the government will act, supported by the official opposition. When the government acts, it will act against the old age pensioners and others on low and fixed incomes. The government will tell them they are getting too greedy, they are too well off and they will get increases of more than 12 per cent or \$2,400 a year. The government will pick on the overwhelming majority of people in this country; that is my prediction. This government talks about fighting inflation and showing restraint, but it is only talk and it only applies to people other than judges, members of parliament, senators and lieutenant governors: it does not apply to corporation executives or professional people.

I did not hear the Minister of Finance complain about the increases that have been taken in the past year and a half by the medical profession in the ten provinces. They have been increasing fees by 10 per cent, and 10 per cent on \$70,000 for a doctor is a pretty nice increase. I should think that 3 per cent or 4 per cent would have been plenty. They have been taking successive increases of 5 per cent to 10 per cent, just the same as the lawyers, engineers, accountants and architects, all of whom got their increases without having to bargain. They never had to ask anyone's permission, yet all their incomes have been rising rapidly. They are all in the upper-middle or high income levels. No one has said a word about showing restraint in relation to those professionals. We did not hear a word in this regard