

Anti-Inflation Act

responsibilities that have been laid before the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Do we hear anything from the Prime Minister or any member of the cabinet to the effect that we are going to take staff from this department? No, that department is to continue as it is. In fact, it is to have an increase of \$16 million over last year. I say to you, sir, that with Mr. Pepin and Mrs. Plumptre monitoring price increases, there should certainly be less for that particular department to do. Surely there could be a cut in the expenditures of the department.

The Canadian International Development Agency is listed as requiring \$734 million, up \$207 million over two years ago. The activities of this agency are questionable. They have been seriously criticized in the committee, not only by members of the official opposition and not only by members of the NDP and of the *Créditiste* party, but also by members of the government party. We have all shared concern over the arbitrary actions taken by the director of the Canadian International Development Agency. I submit that these expenditures should be severely examined and curtailed by the present administration.

If you check back on some of my proposals, you will find that they come close to a saving of \$1 billion, an amount which I submit could be cut off this year's proposals without in any way hurting the lifestyle of Canadians. There are many, many more, but rather than burdening the record I will let hon. members look at the estimate books themselves. However, instead of following the course I am suggesting that our Prime Minister is running up and down this nation, and instead of explaining his policy to the people he is threatening the labouring man, the businessman and the average Canadian. Instead of going hat in hand and saying, "I did make some mistakes: I did construe your wants as needs and I taxed the people accordingly; I am sorry"—instead of saying something along that line and that he will try to do better, he is out there at the various meeting halls literally threatening Canadians. He is saying, in effect, "You do as I say, or else."

In the press he is reported as having said, "If you get a raise we will tax it away from you directly or we will tax the company and take it away at the source, or we will take it from the company." What hypocrisy this is! This Prime Minister and this government should seek the co-operation of the people and they should provide an example for all of us.

To date the Prime Minister has said nothing about decreasing the staff of bureaucrats in government. He has said nothing about reducing unemployment insurance benefits for those who refuse to work. He has said nothing about tax incentives for small business. He has said nothing about tax incentives for individuals in this nation—and thank God for them—who are willing to work harder. We hear nothing of this nature from the Prime Minister.

I say to you, sir, that the times call for bold, cold and harsh government cuts and for rewarding the output efforts of others so we can compete in world markets. Instead of following this course, the Prime Minister has been fiddle-faddling and fuddle-duddling while the nation is burning. In closing, I would commend the words of that great United States president, Abraham Lincoln, for the consideration of the government, for they are as true today as they were when they were first uttered. He said:

[Mr. Crouse.]

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help a man permanently by doing for him what he could do for himself.

I urge this government to give these views serious thought, for in these gems of wisdom spoken by a great leader of another country lies Canada's only real hope for a prosperous future.

[Translation]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty as a member of Parliament to express my views on Bill C-73 introduced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) to enforce the contents of the white paper as an attack against rising consumer prices.

In 1968, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) offered to the nation a political program whose first objective was to establish a just society. The people believed in the Liberal party's promises and in the just society for all Canadians of good will. The Liberal party won the election with a very large majority. From that moment, it had the power to legislate to establish a more equitable society in Canada.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, a just society is one that first recognizes to every individual and every family the right to an adequate income to meet its essential needs, that is to say, an income which would enable each family to live above the poverty level, as defined by the Senate Committee report on poverty.

Nature imposes on family heads the sacred duty to feed and provide for their children. It goes even further. Because children resemble their fathers—they are somewhat the continuations of their beings—nature inspires them with the idea that they must provide for their future and create an inheritance which will help them fend for themselves, along the perilous journey of their lives, against the strokes of fate. Is it with minimum wages of \$2.60 an hour that the head of a family can live up to his obligations and make his dreams come true? And yet, we have been told that the minimum wage level in the province of Quebec has been frozen at \$2.60 an hour.

However, judging from the white paper and the bill under review, I am afraid that small earners will be put at a disadvantage and that the gap which separates them from the privileged of society will grow even wider, which may be a source of social disturbance which will benefit no one.

● (1640)

It is the duty of the state to favour greater co-operation between capital-labour and capital-money. Capital-labour has rights, but it has responsibilities as well. One of these is to provide faithfully all the labour it has agreed to provide under a free and fair contract. It must make every effort to provide a performance of quality which will contribute to lower production costs, as well as facilitate better competition, which would serve to fight effectively against unemployment.

On the other hand, the rich and the businessman must not treat workers as slaves. They should justly respect in them the dignity of man, as well as their human rights. Physical labour is far from being shameful.