

Motion Respecting House Vote

awarded. Well, everybody would like to get a 30 per cent wage increase every year; but you cannot do it and remain competitive.

This began the fashion. Workers said that if the government insisted on 30 per cent wage increases they would take no less.

Another thing the government did was to make an illegal strike legal, by dealing with a union in circumstances of an illegal or wild-cat strike. They dealt with the Montreal dockworkers who were out on an illegal strike. Were the dockworkers penalized? No; they were given a 30 per cent wage increase. This undermines the position of any labour leader who is conscientious and tries to do an honest job. If he goes to his union and recommends workers to seek a reasonable increase in wages or tells them not to go out on an illegal strike because they have a contract which requires them to stay on the job until a certain date, his members say to him: Don't talk that way to us; if you cannot take us out on a wildcat and get a 30 per cent wage increase, we will get the fellow who did the job in Montreal. Any honest labour leader finds his position undermined, and this is one of the reasons labour costs have gone so high today.

Finally, on July 1 we shall face one of the most severe economic threats this country has ever faced, due to the wholesale dumping of cheap foreign goods which will start in the most unprecedented volume any of us have ever seen. What is dumping? Dumping is carried out because in the big producing countries they have massive runs and cannot afford to start up again, even if a product has been well received. However, lest retailers should demand more than had been expected the manufacturers overrun to the extent of 5 or 10 per cent and then, at the end of the season, if there is no demand for these goods, they look for a market in which they can dump them.

So far, we have been protected in Canada by provisions known as fair market value legislation, which we refined while in office. This makes it necessary for an exporter to show that the goods he is sending into this country are offered at the same market value as they possessed in his own country. This government threw all that protection out the window when it signed the agreement in Geneva. The new agreement will allow people to send goods to this country in any quantity, unless it can be proved that damage is done to our whole industry as a result. This has to be determined before a board in Ottawa, and anyone with experience knows it would take

[Mr. Hees.]

months before such a board would reach a decision on whether an industry was injured or not. Meanwhile whole industries, whole sections of the country would be obliterated. This is what will happen starting on July 1.

I could go on and on but time does not allow. I think I have given the house an idea why practical men in this country have no confidence in this government, one composed of men who have no knowledge of business affairs and who, what's more, don't give a damn about business affairs; all they want is to stay in government. They want to hang on to power because they love power, they love to govern, they think they govern by divine right. The measure upon which they were defeated was a money bill involving taxation and there is nothing more important in our national life than the determination of the taxes the people shall pay. In their own Canada Year Book hon. members opposite say that when the government is defeated on a money bill it has no alternative but to resign.

Are they resigning? No, they are hanging on because they are desperately seeking to hold on to power as long as they can, knowing that the last two Gallup polls say they are deader than the dodo. When the people of Canada learn what they have been doing to the economy of this country, what they have been doing to parliamentary rights and procedures and for the protection of individuals against tyrants and dictators such as themselves, the electorate will look after them in a very effective manner—and very, very soon, I hope.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, it has been said repeatedly for some time that the person who wanted to destroy the country and harm parliament was the member for Lapointe. Well, after hearing what the Liberals said about the Conservatives, and what the Conservatives and the New Democrats said about the Liberals, I am led to believe that I am the only member who does not wish to destroy parliament. It is rather the two old-line parties who intend to destroy it by the charges they have been hurling at each other—to the effect that their role is not to destroy parliament—and all kinds of charges that have never been levelled against me. Since the Tories and the Grits, the Conservatives and the Liberals, want to destroy parliament, I shall therefore leave it to them to do so.

As for me, I adopted right from the start a very well defined and clear attitude on the