

Anti-Inflation Act

through the economy and home to head office in New York. Even Northern Electric is setting up its international office in the United States, so Canadian companies too will be able to avoid these provisions.

Even some of Canada's business leaders, while giving cautious support to the bill, have had some reservations. Both the president of the Bank of Montreal and representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association have indicated that while the bill might do some good, it would have been a great deal more useful 18 months ago. My party does not agree with this, of course, but it is an interesting comment on the ability of the government to make its timing and programs useless to everyone.

Soon we will be stuck with a bill which gives unprecedented power to government bureaucrats and hacks of various kinds, without any review by parliament. The government wants the right to change the guidelines at will without having to suffer the indignity of going before parliament and justifying its actions.

It is at least reasonable that the government will not want to discuss this bill again, for it can have only one of two effects—either its restraints will be successful in stopping any economic recovery, thereby throwing thousands more Canadians out of work, or the economy will recover in spite of it. The Minister of Finance has admitted that much of our inflation is imported, so just perhaps, Madam Speaker, we can import our recovery in spite of this bill.

I read recently that there has been a downturn in inflation throughout the world. The United States has just enjoyed the largest percentage gain in its GNP in 20 years. Inflation in the world, particularly in our closest trading partner, is in a downward spiral, and I tend to be very cynical about this kind of measure. The wage and price controls are to come off in three years, and it is also very significant that in three years there will be a federal election. I wonder if because inflation is on a downward spiral the government throws up this sham, Bill C-73; then of course in spite of the bill inflation will come down, and the government in 1978 will lift its wage and price controls and claim that its policy worked, at the same time claiming good government as a reason for re-election. That is the kind of scenario I see, and it is a cynical one on the part of the government.

It seems to me that common sense would make government members see the inequities in this wage control bill. Surely they can see that those who are unorganized and poor will not even receive the benefit of the 10 per cent on an average wages of \$6,000 per year, or \$600. They will not necessarily receive that. The fact is that they will probably receive much less. Surely hon. members opposite can see the inadequacies and the injustice of this bill.

The minister on television the other night said that this bill would go through second reading tomorrow or in a couple of days. I do not know what he was reading, but because of the need to amend this bill in a very effective way and to give it some kind of justice—it ought to be comprehensive and just, which it is not—it seems to me that hon. members should not permit this bill to become law until many of the inequities are corrected, so that we can pass legislation which is fair to all, whether they be high income earners or poor people in Canada.

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Madam Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Leader!

Mr. Grafftey: As we address ourselves to this bill, we cannot debate it in particular without a brief economic review of Canada over the past four years, and of what has brought about the necessity of imposing this kind of harsh legislation.

After seven and a half years of Trudeau socialism, and that is what we must call it—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. All hon. members who wish to participate will be allowed to do so later. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey) now has the floor.

Mr. Grafftey: As I go across the country and people ask me what I mean by Trudeau socialism, I say that it is a very easy story to tell.

An hon. Member: Speak on the bill.

Mr. Grafftey: I can understand the frustration of the hon. member, but she will just have to sit there and bear it.

Between 1958 and 1962 when there were mostly Liberals and Conservatives in this House I remember going back to my province, the province of Quebec, and very often around the island of Montreal there would be various forums in which people wanted the Liberal Party, the Progressive Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party to be represented. It was easy to find members from the Liberal side and the Progressive Conservative side, but in a *noblesse oblige* fashion the various institutions invariably invited the NDP to send a representative to these many meetings. The same person always turned up, and he gave the extreme socialist line—the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who at that time was a part time professor at the university of Montreal—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grafftey: This may be difficult to listen to, but sit back and listen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Grafftey: I know that hon. members opposite do not like this story, but it is going to be told, and told again and again.

In the 1963 elections the Prime Minister voted for, worked for, and contributed to the New Democratic Party—caught the political bug, if you will—but he knew one thing we do not do in Quebec; that we do not send socialists to Ottawa. Instead of working with such honourable Canadians as Charles Taylor to build up the NDP, the Prime Minister took on the Liberal Party and, whether we like it or not, what we have in Canada today is Trudeau socialism.