

posal to the federal government. They maintain it should be a national policy. But the Liberals have rejected it. In short, the Liberals have a program that will control only the average person's income, whether he be salaried or a wage earner. It does not control the income of professionals and it does not control prices.

My time is almost up, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I shall have to ask a colleague of mine to deal with a matter I had hoped to raise concerning a specific and major loophole in the program, in a sector that has a major impact on inflation, namely, the oil industry. There have been questions and answers in the last two days in the House which clearly demonstrate that the government has no interest in putting effective controls on the oil industry, but my colleague will be dealing with this shortly.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Take more time, if you want. I am sure the House will agree.

Mr. Broadbent: I do not want to abuse the privilege of the House. I conclude by saying that the amendment proposed by the official opposition is unacceptable to us, because what is not acceptable and just in the long run is certainly not acceptable for 18 months. We intend to vote against the motion, as we intend to vote against the bill as a whole. This program is unfair. It does not deal directly with inflation, with housing, energy prices, food costs. It does not deal with the kind of specific instruments that are needed to fight inflation in those sectors outlined by members of my party in a special debate a week ago Friday.

I regret to see that the reason the official opposition is going to vote against this bill is simply that it did not get an amendment passed within their time framework. I should have liked to see them join with us in voting against the bill because it is the unjust package that it is.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to hear the minister this afternoon reply to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) who moved this motion, which in its narrow terms merely seeks to bring this program to an end by April 30, 1977, rather than giving the government the powers it seeks until December 31, 1978. That is the sum and total of the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition and it is entirely in keeping with what he has been proposing. It is consistent, as he has pointed out, with his comments made at the time of the white paper and also when the government introduced the legislation on October 14.

I must say I was rather amused to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) dream on, trying to put some sort of coloration upon the stand taken by the opposition on this bill. With regard to the question of controls, in February of 1973 the Conservative party proposed an incomes policy as one of the tools for fighting inflation and an election was fought over that issue. As any member of this chamber knows, the Liberal party and the New Democratic Party, each for its own particular reason, opposed controls as a tool to fight inflation. That was their stand in 1974. The former leader of the New Democratic Party spent the first three or four weeks of the election campaign attacking the conservative proposal as though it were the only proposal in the armoury of this party for dealing with inflation. Up to that point a good part of the press just

Anti-Inflation Act

ignored inflation. They just carried on as though everything was the best of all possible worlds, at least according to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Benjamin: They were wrestling inflation to the ground.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No mention was made of wrestling inflation to the ground; that came later. They scared the voters in Ontario and in Quebec, as though controls were the only tool to be used to fight inflation, but the voters in the rest of Canada thought otherwise. What happened in Ontario with the New Democrats? They had controls as well. They had a prices review board with powers of roll-back. It only takes seconds of consideration to know that is a full, mandatory price control of wages, rents and everything in the armoury.

● (1730)

The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) says "just prices". What holds up prices? What is one of the chief constituents of any price—wages. Wages come in heavily in any element of price, as do rents and profit. In any consideration of price one must consider all the elements. The net result, we know, is that the former leader of the New Democratic Party did such a good job of hoodwinking the Ontario voters that when it came about that there would be a prices and review board, the voters saw what it was. What did they do? They said they would not have either. They took the position that the Liberals had told them everything was going fine and that they would just be fed dollars, that the program would be upped; there would not be too much indexing, but the government would give so that the people would be compensated for inflation.

We know what they did with the money supply. Be that as it may, I want to deal with the point the Minister of Finance was trying to make, I think quite wrongly, namely, that the purpose of this amendment is somehow to cut back the program of controls, that the 90-day freeze, plus up to two years of controls was 27 months, and how far is that from 42 months as is now proposed; therefore it is really not very much different. That is not the purpose. The minister should have quoted fully what was said by the House leader of the official opposition the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). I underline that sometimes it is very dangerous to quote out of context. Let us look at what the hon. member for Peace River said on October 17. I shall put it all on the record so there will be no ambiguity about it. I shall quote from the first column on page 8314 of *Hansard* for October 17. The hon. member said:

To begin with, I am simply appalled at the effrontery of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the government in asking this House to grant to it the unique, extraordinary and terrifying powers, to use the minister's words, which are asked for for an open-ended period of time. I would protest if my own party asked for those powers. Despite the respect and admiration I have for my leader, I would oppose him if he introduced legislation of this kind, although I could never see him seeking to do so in these terms. Let me put it simply in this way: the legislation as it presently stands would permit this government, some time in the late fall of 1978, to put forward and ram through motions which could extend for another two, three or four years the kind of legislation which we are considering. I am not prepared to entrust this power to any group of people, and certainly not to this government.