

proposing controls on all Canadians the like of which we have never seen except during wartime, yet he is refusing to tell us what the situation is, or is expected to be.

Some of us with some contacts have made some inquiries. I have before me the estimates made by a very respected non-partisan and non-political institute, namely, the Institute of Quantitative Analysis of the University of Toronto. Let me place on the record the kind of estimate they made with the help of their computer. Their computer is similar to that used by the Department of Finance.

● (1640)

They estimate that the cost of living for the next year, without the anti-inflation program and the controls the government proposes, would have risen from the 10½ per cent increase we had in the last year to 11.3 per cent in the coming year. I do not think that is the kind of increase which would necessitate the almost war action the government is proposing.

Let us look at what they tell us the increase in the cost of living will be in the next year with the control program. As a result of this tremendous interference in the lives of the ordinary citizens of Canada, what will the increase in the cost of living be in the next year according to the University of Toronto Institute of Quantitative Analysis? Will it be, instead of 10½ per cent, 5 per cent, 7 per cent or 8 per cent? In other words, will there be a substantial reduction in the cost of living? According to the Institute of Quantitative Analysis the increase in the coming year will be 9.6 per cent.

After all the mountain of effort we will have a mouse-like decrease in the cost of living of less than 1 per cent. But the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau), the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance say that the people they want to protect, the people who need the assistance, are not the businessmen, the professional people or the organized workers because they can look after themselves. That is what the hon. member for Gloucester said, and he is right. The organized worker will get the 10 per cent which the government says is the maximum he can get. Of course he will get it because he has the economic power. But what about the poor and the unorganized workers whom the hon. member for Gloucester said will be helped by this program?

Mr. Breau: I did not say that.

Mr. Orlikow: I have in front of me a table prepared by Statistics Canada which shows the percentage of the gross national product each fifth of the population has received for the last 25 years. These figures are very interesting because they answer, I think very well, the simple question asked by the hon. member for Gloucester—what happens to the poor people?

Let us go back 25 years. In 1951 the bottom one-fifth of the people in Canada, the lowest 20 per cent of the workers, received 4.4 per cent of the gross national product.

An hon. Member: Quite a few of them were in New Brunswick.

Mr. Orlikow: Yes, and also in Newfoundland. What did the top 20 per cent receive? They received 42.8 per cent. In

Anti-Inflation Program

1974, 25 years later, again under a Liberal government, the bottom 20 per cent, after all the so-called programs to help the poor people, received .4 per cent less than they received in 1951. What did the top 20 per cent get? They received 42.4 per cent.

I want to place on the record two other very interesting figures. I refer to the figures for 1971 and 1972. That was the last time the Liberal government tried, it said, to do something about inflation and to help the poor people. That is the time John Young and his incomes board were working. What did they accomplish? Here is the record. In 1971 under a Liberal government, with the same Prime Minister, what did the bottom 20 per cent receive in respect of the gross national product? Instead of the 4.4 per cent they received in 1951, they received 3.6 per cent in 1971. What did the top 20 per cent receive 20 years later in 1971? They received 43.3 per cent of the gross national product.

In 1972, while John Young was still charging on his white charger, the bottom 20 per cent received 3.8 per cent of the gross national product while the top 20 per cent received 42.9 per cent of the gross national product. That is an indication of how much the Liberal government and the Liberal Party care about the poor people. Liberal members and the Minister of Finance say—although they originally said that the people at the bottom could get \$600 and the people at the top \$2,400—in terms of an increase they have looked at it again, have found they made a mistake, and are now giving the people at the bottom \$750. How can the people at the bottom get a cent? They are unorganized. How does a woman working as a waitress on Sparks Street get that \$750?

An hon. Member: What would she get without the controls?

Mr. Orlikow: I was coming to that. She would get precisely the same wage she is getting now. What we propose, what we proposed the same night the Prime Minister outlined his anti-inflation proposal, and what we have proposed every day since then, and what we are saying to the provincial governments is let the provincial and federal governments get together and bring in legislation to increase the minimum wage. If we are concerned about the people at the bottom that is the way to bring up their income.

I do not say that the minimum wage should be the \$4 that I believe has been proposed by the Canadian Labour Congress, but how about a straight 50 cents an hour increase in all jurisdictions, federal and provincial? This is what we should have if we are worried about the poor people. This is a concrete proposal. I will wait for the hon. member for Gloucester to propose that to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro). I will make this proposal to the government of Manitoba.

The people at the lowest end of the income scale are not organized. They have no economic power and are at the mercy of their employers. I do not intend to be critical of their employers as individuals because they are engaged in a cut-throat business where, if they increase their wage rate, they are in difficulty unless their competitors do the same. However, an increase in the minimum wage rate would mean that every person at the bottom, including