Mr. Broadbent: Yes, indeed, we favour some kinds of controls.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Let's put it on the record.

Mr. Broadbent: I say to the hon. member that it is this set of controls we oppose. The Liberals nod sagely. Let me say—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) has the floor for the purpose of making a speech, and I suggest we listen to him.

Mr. Broadbent: Let me state it as clearly and as succinctly, and I must emphasize, as simply as possible so the Liberals will understand it, that the New Democratic Party does indeed believe in some kinds of control program in certain sectors. In any advanced economy anywhere in the world controls have been in effect. If they knew what they were doing, a selection could be made of certain sectors of the economy and then it makes sense to interfere with the market place. What we have objected to is this abysmal set of controls which the Liberals have inflicted on the people of Canada with the only result being that of holding wages and salaries down while letting prices go up. That is what we oppose.

House prices, as I indicated, are up year over year by some 9 per cent. On a $50,000 house, which is not out of line unfortunately for a typical family buying in most urban parts of Canada, that means year over year an increase of around $4,500 in price. We have calculated that because of this government's attitude on mortgages, not moving in and holding them down, with the cumulative impact over the life of the typical mortgage with that kind of a price increase would be $12,000. A family would have to pay this amount in additional cost just as a result of the year over year increase in the price of a house. So mortgages are one sector, I repeat, not just for the home owner but for the renters, where the government could have moved in with the Bank Act and forced the banks to bring down mortgages, making changes in the regulations to ensure that the banks put up money at a low level in mortgages.

Another area of cost that affects most families in Canada is that of the energy prices. What has the Government of Canada done about that? It has allowed the oil industry, the multinationals, to charge Canadians world prices for our own oil resources. What has this meant? For example it meant that they put up by $1 a barrel the price of oil last July, with another $1 a barrel on January 1, this year. Its accumulated impact on ordinary Canadian families, we have calculated in terms of cost. The increase in cost to drive cars and heat homes has been $150 a year. That cost could have been controlled and held down. Instead of permitting oil companies to cash in on decisions that were made a few years ago in the Middle East by the oil producing cartel, instead of permitting that cartel to have its hands stretched across our border and charge Canadians these prices, we could have held down oil prices and reduced the cost of living for Canadians.

Another practical matter and an area within federal jurisdiction, and where the government could have moved in on, is that of car prices. Most Canadians buy cars. Most families have them. We have an agreement with the United States that is supposed to ensure price parity between the two countries. Instead we get constant escalation of Canadian prices that are out of line with the goal of price parity. The government should have told the automotive companies that there could be no price increase this year until the prices are in line with the United States for the same products. Instead, the major manufacturers just announced they will increase their prices by 3 per cent. This will mean a $150 price increase for a typical car. Most Canadians buy their cars on time over a three-year period, paying 12 per cent or 18 per cent interest. This will increase the interest charges they will have to pay.

• (1632)

If the government were committed to selective action, there are a number of areas like that where it could have some real impact on prices. I refer to energy, housing, car prices, and there are others. I do not want to belabour the point this afternoon.

An hon. Member: Good.

Mr. Broadbent: A Liberal member says "good". There is always a capacity for massive indigestion whenever one feeds a Liberal the truth.

I will not string out the list of particular categories of price areas that affect a typical family that could have been acted upon on a selective basis by a government committed to dealing with inflation. However, we did not have that. We had this bogus controls program which, as I said, simply ensured the restriction and inhibition of wage and salary increases for ordinary Canadians.

I will not take quite as much time as the second speaker on this bill. I would like to indicate in my comments the general direction that the New Democratic Party believes is required in dealing with an economy such as ours at this time. Although I will be brief this afternoon, this is an illustration in short form of a general policy that has been developed and enunciated in the past.

First, we believe the Government of Canada ought to recognize at long last what has been accepted by governments as different as those of Japan, France, Sweden and West Germany. Two of those countries have social democratic governments, two do not. What they all have in common is a commitment to national economic planning. Entailed in that is a sophisticated approach to developing certain industrial sectors to ensure employment. It is no accident that all of those countries I have just mentioned have unemployment rates that are not even half the unemployment level in Canada. I am saying this in the context of dealing with inflation as well.

Those countries take sophisticated counter-cyclical policies over a period of time, not to remove entirely but to try to level out the cyclical nature of market economies so that the impact of inflation is minimized. That requires a commitment to