

done only by some planning group working confidentially within government, with the results sprung on parliament and the public to be accepted or rejected without individual Canadians or their elected representatives having taken full part in developing them. There must be wide involvement of Canadians generally. There also should be a way of ensuring that any consensus developed will in fact be a basis for action by government where such is the most appropriate way of helping achieve the goals sought.

One approach is the establishment of a royal commission. However, there is a risk that such a body will seem remote and apart from the ongoing process of Canadian life, and the commissioners may not turn out to be sufficiently representative of Canadian regions or sufficiently attuned to the concerns of individual Canadians. There is also the matter of additional expense.

I would propose, instead, the setting up of a special parliamentary committee on national goals. Its make-up would reflect the regions of Canada. Its members would have that sensitivity which comes from being part of the political system. The committee would be able to hold hearings in all parts of the country, hearings which would be made easily accessible to individuals and groups. The cost would be much less than that of a royal commission. There would be no extra expense for salaries and offices, and with only limited additional expense for staff and administration.

Finally, the report of such a committee would be produced by people who are part of the process which is part of the making and implementing of federal government policy. Where the report called for action by the federal government, that government would be accountable to the Canadian people for such action or the lack of it through the caucus of its supporters and through the House of Commons and its committees generally. The Special Joint Committee on the Constitution did excellent work and is, I think, one precedent for the kind of committee I am proposing. I would, therefore, urge that the government ask parliament to create a special committee on national goals at an early date.

The success of the anti-inflation program requires the involvement and effort of all Canadians. The working out of measures to deal with the underlying problems of the Canadian economy as we move through and go beyond the period of the controls programs requires this co-operative involvement and effort as well. I hope there will be an early statement by the government as to how it envisages this work being carried out.

To conclude, let me say that I believe that meanwhile the changes in the program proposed in Bill C-89 are urgently required, and therefore the bill deserves speedy approval by this House.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, about five months ago the government introduced to this House Bill C-73 with a great deal of bravado—certainly much more bravado than planning. I was interested to hear the comments this afternoon of the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) asking for support for this legislation in its amended form. I was encouraged by some of the things he said. He said that there has to be increased productivity in our country. I could not agree more. How-

ever, I do not know whether the rewarding of workers for increased productivity by a maximum 2 per cent bonus will really encourage productivity, as the hon. member hopes.

Second, he suggested that what the government should do is exercise some leadership and he proposed the inauguration of a national productivity centre. I beg to differ with the hon. member on that point. It seems to me that any kind of government program, even a national productivity centre, would be totally unproductive. We would have bureaucracy finding more job-creation programs and this would not increase one iota the productivity of the country. It would simply be shuffling around some of the bureaucrats.

The hon. member went on to enumerate some of the reasons for there being no greater productivity in our country. I agree with the reasons he cited. But what he failed to do was question those elements in our society which are the reason for our not being as productive as we should be. He did not say why, for example, there is no more money going into better management or into secondary industry. Perhaps we should ask whether the government should not offer some leadership in productivity by creating incentives for these industries, so that there will be more desire for management to reproduce the industries that we so desperately need in our country.

Some weeks ago I was shocked to hear, in a news report from Vancouver, the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board, Mr. Pepin, who was being questioned by some businessmen in Vancouver—I know that news clips can be misleading—saying, "I really do not know anything about this business." I wondered whether I was hearing something out of context—or is this really where it is at? Does the chairman know how to handle the heavy responsibilities which he has?

There are serious questions facing us in this legislation, even in its amended form, which make me question the viability of the entire program and whether or not we should support it. Basically, we oppose the bill for two main reasons. First, even a casual glance shows that it will produce endless cases of unfairness and inequity for the people of Canada. Second, there is no end in sight to the rapidly accumulating regulations as a result of this program.

The fears that we voiced when this bill was first introduced to parliament have proven to be very true. Just the other day there was a headline in one of the local papers saying that the board now has a backlog of 1,000 cases on which it must rule. The other day I saw an article which stated that the Anti-Inflation Board is now too busy to handle the orientation program for some of the union officials who want to be trained in the program so they can meet it on its own ground.

There is a growing suspicion in our country that the AIB will be harder on wage earners and consumers than it is on industry and prices. What frightened us even more was the fact that the original program contained no process of appeal, no final court or appeal. I recall the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) time and time again being questioned on this topic. He always answered by saying, "What is the matter with that? Why should we need any court of appeal?" The Minister now presents himself to this House