

petroleum corporation advocated by us. The NDP saw that as the first step in a series that would lead to a total public ownership and control of Canada's petroleum resources. How do the Liberals see this national petroleum corporation? They have already cut back on last year's budget. They took the guts out of the corporation by significantly reducing its budget, and it will play a very minor role in the petroleum sector. It will amount to nothing.

The point I am making, Madam Speaker, is that just because the New Democratic Party comes up with an idea and a name, it does not mean that the Liberals, when they take over the name, also take over the idea. In fact, they are pastmasters of doing the very opposite: they retain the name and the propaganda, but take the guts out of the idea. I suggest that this is what they have done with the Anti-Inflation Board. We proposed such an idea and said that one aspect of the powers of the board could be to order rollbacks in certain sectors of the economy. When the minister attacked us for neglecting our own policy, what he failed to mention in his speech was that we also said that for such a board to be operative, both in terms of holding down prices and minimizing the extent of the bureaucracy required, there should be a number of price freezes, that would come in automatically when the board was set up, in a number of key sectors of the economy. These were spelled out to the minister in speeches by David Lewis and by myself in the past. I do not know why the minister neglected to mention that. He may have neglected to mention it precisely because this government has not ordered any price freeze in any sector. Dealing with price increases is left entirely to the so-called profit control mechanism.

Once again the Liberals have taken a New Democratic Party idea that made some sense in regard to controlling price increases, an idea that said that in key sectors of the economy a freeze should be applied, with the corporations having to justify increases. But this idea has been turned upside down. In true historical fashion, the Liberals have turned the idea on its head. They have selected a number of sectors and let the corporations increase prices, making the people, via a government agency, justify any order for a rollback. We put the onus on the corporations. They put it on the people. It is this kind of approach that will require many more bureaucrats than would have been the case with our proposal. The way we see the board function is to put the onus on the corporations, as is the case now, for example, with Bell Canada, to justify any price increase. If they cannot be justified, then the increases would not be permitted.

Having talked about the prices proposal and why we think this board will be ineffective and the wage proposal unfair, I now want to say that one of the preconditions that the minister and the Prime Minister have talked about in the past in terms of such a program being effective—quite apart from its technical details—is that a board cross-section of the community would have to find it acceptable.

In his speech on Friday the minister said he welcomed the "generally strong support" that the program had received in Canada. Well, I do not know where he got that, whether he was talking to the members of his own family, or maybe talking to the converts in the Liberal party caucus who are suddenly committed to the idea. I listened

Anti-Inflation Act

to "Cross Canada Check-up" and I have been reading the press and taking part in open-line radio programs, but I do not find widespread acceptance of this program. I do not find it for the reasons that have already been alluded to: it is full of inequities; it is full of conditions that will make it not only unfair but unworkable. Therefore, I say to the minister that one of the preconditions that he has set for a workable program, namely, that it will have widespread public acceptance, simply does not exist. If anything, I judge right now that there are more people in Canada opposed to the program than in support of it.

This means that in the days ahead the minister is going to have a lot of trouble. There is no feeling at all in Canada, in our view, that this program will gain acceptance, and the reason is that it is a program that does not deserve to gain acceptance.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Before recognizing the hon. member for Drummond (Mr. Pinard), I would like to list the questions to be debated tonight.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—National Revenue—Proposal to obtain building from Air Canada for computer centre in Winnipeg—Request for report; the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon)—National Defence—Effect of anti-inflation program on choice of long range patrol aircraft; the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain)—Penitentiaries—Proposed institution at Morna, New Brunswick—Government position in view of objections.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR RESTRAINT OF PROFIT MARGINS,
PRICES, DIVIDENDS AND COMPENSATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-73, to provide for the restraint of profit margins, prices, dividends and compensation in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.