

Anti-Inflation Act

And he was right. I have in hand, Mr. Speaker, another American magazine, *The Business Week*, dated March 16, 1974. It lists all the American banks two years before the increase in oil and gas prices throughout the world. American banks moved to Saudi Arabia, in the Middle East. They took over the banks and we have the evidence on page 40 of *The Business Week* of March 16, 1974, which depicts the increase in oil and gas prices all over the world. American banks settled down in the Middle East, opened up new branches and took over the control of Middle East banks. Now, two years later, the price of gasoline and oil went up, all over the world. Billions of dollars found their way to the Middle East, were deposited in American banks, and returned to the United States or elsewhere in the world under the form of investments called "Arab investments".

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a legislation which is supposed to be anti-inflation, and we know the economic foundation of monopolies and of the banks which control international interests. This legislation will automatically lead Canada to a totalitarian dictatorship and the government will be unable to control the multinational corporations. Why? Because our legislation cannot apply to monopolies whose headquarters is not in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the solution advocated by the right hon. Prime Minister because I know it will lead the country toward figures which now seem stupid. For instance, it seems that if a worker wants to keep pace with an inflation of 10 per cent a year from 1974 to the year 2,000, he will have to earn an average income of about \$200,000 around the year 2,000 because of the eccentricities of the present economic structure and its upward trend. The economists who support the government have no alternative solution except to continue with this system which works in reverse and is ruining the country and the savings and which will ruin private enterprise and personal initiative and create a board which will have to be more powerful than the government to intrude in private and corporate fields because the government failed to take its responsibilities. Only the government has the economic and financial power to reverse inflation. The government should have announced an economic policy which would allow it to roll back prices by at least 10 per cent a year instead of increasing them by 10 per cent.

It would have been to the advantage of consumers and producers for the government to introduce fiscal and monetary legislation allowing a reversal of the Canadian economy within 5 years through a price reduction of 10 per cent a year.

Instead, the government is placing itself above producers and this will certainly not protect the consumers who will have to suffer one way or another for this so-called price freeze. The government will perhaps freeze wages, but it will not be able to freeze prices because the Canadian economy is monopolistic. Monopolies control the Canadian economy. One only has to refer to the number of books available here at the parliamentary library and containing the information about the structures of monopolies existing in Canada. In this way you will understand the link that exists between them. That is why the price and wage control policy is an absolutely disastrous policy, a negative policy. It is not a progressive policy, it is not a policy to encourage the farmer, the

[Mr. Rondeau.]

individual or the worker to produce more because with 10 per cent a year, the result will be, based on the figures I quoted earlier, that a salary of \$8,000 in 1974 will correspond to a salary of \$164,000 in the year 2,000.

Perhaps the figures I just gave are not taken seriously. One only has to figure it out. Take an adding machine, figure out a progression of 10 per cent a year, and see the figure you can come up with. That might allow you to realize that the savings, the goods, the work being done now, as those of other producers and consumers of this country, are going directly to ruin because this government did not come up with the policy it should have to halt inflation.

The government listened once again to the economists who created inflation in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to announce that when it will be time to vote on this bill in this House, I will be voting with both hands, and if I could vote more than once against this bill, I would.

[English]

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, a former Liberal prime minister once said that in politics one must do as one does at sea in a sailing ship—not steer a straight course to one's destination, but pay regard to prevailing winds. I suspect that our present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) did pay regard to prevailing winds when he suggested to his cabinet colleagues and to the people of Canada that a program of price and income controls should be imposed as a solution to the ailing economic difficulties of our country.

I confess I do not share the degree of enthusiasm my colleagues have expressed—particularly my colleagues on the other side of the House—about this program. As a matter of fact, I would have hoped it would never have been necessary to impose measures of this kind upon the Canadian people; I would have hoped that someone would eventually have been able to manage our economy in a statesmanlike fashion, capable of the kind of fiscal and monetary performance which would have ruled out the type of measures we are now discussing. I am also concerned about the despicable performance of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) when he first introduced the white paper on the guidelines and, later, the bill now before us. It is nothing new. It should have been no surprise to us who have become accustomed to that kind of procedure on the part of a minister who sold us an energy package a couple of months ago and used cheap political tricks in an attempt to discredit an opposition which had serious reservations about some of the propositions he was putting forward.

I might add that some of the reservations we expressed at that time have proved to be fully justified. As the House will recall, we were talking about energy conservation, Petro-Can and Syncrude. There are probably not many members in the House today who know there have been developments in the process used to gain oil from the tar sands of Alberta, and that oil can now be extracted at a fraction of the cost envisaged under the plan the present Minister of Finance bought on behalf of the Canadian people. It would be fair to speculate that the minister fell victim to a con game on the part of international oil companies who knew there was better technology in the