

Postal workers have just turned down the conciliator's recommendation for a 38 per cent wage boost over a 30-month period, the equivalent of the increase postmen obtained last spring.

Very often, groups of workers have been without collective agreements for many months; the postal workers' agreement expired at the end of 1974, the nurses in Quebec have been without a contract since June and the social workers in Alberta have been expecting higher pay since March.

The October 20 issue of the Montreal daily *Le Devoir* mentioned, on page 6, that the General Council of the National Federation of Quebec Teachers had decided last weekend to ask the CNTU to organize, together with the other trade unions, a counterattack against the anti-inflation measures.

In an atmosphere such as this, one can easily imagine the problems the chairman of the new board and his assistant will have to face. A final decision apparently is still pending on their respective salaries, but I have great reasons to believe that both will have a lot of work to do. I have no doubt about the competence of the chairman who has to his credit a lot of experience in the business field. I hope that his generally smiling approach will survive the inevitable problems which will certainly arise during his term of office. In his televised speech, the Prime Minister mentioned that people all over the world are caught in the grip of the revolution of rising expectations.

● (1430)

We have come to the point where we think that, by virtue of some magic formula, we can provide ourselves cheaply and in plenty, while constantly improving our standard of living, with food, energy, housing and government's services. We feel that all that is due to us without any respect for the collective increase in goods and services. That is the point the Prime Minister made after having advised every Canadian to live within their means.

However, I share the opinion put forward by newspaperman Normand Girard who wrote on October 18:

Mr. Trudeau, it appears, has overlooked in his guidelines one of the most important factors responsible for the cost of living hike in Canada: publicity.

How could such an exhortation by Mr. Trudeau, be it televised across the country, compete with the constant exhortation to spending imposed on Canadian homes by the manufacturers of everything consumable?

At one time we are shown the most beautiful car, at another time we are shown the biggest car. Later we have the latest in furs before our eyes;

Department stores go as far as offering consumers credit cards by telephone. In short, everything in our society of consumerism encourages people to live beyond their means.

Therefore, would it not have been consistent for the Canadian government to include some restrictions on advertisement which encourages spending?

The "ordinary people" who will choose not to abide by the anti-inflation measures will be put in prison, but television, radio, newspapers and magazines will be allowed to continue in all impunity to encourage them to do so.

Is not the ordinary person sometimes right to question the consistency and seriousness of his governments?

On October 14, here in the House of Commons, my colleague from Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) quoted the definition of the word "inflation" given by the Larousse dictionary at page 543:

Anti-Inflation Act

Inflation: Déséquilibre économique caractérisé par une hausse générale des prix, et qui provient de l'excès de pouvoir d'achat de la masse des consommateurs (particulier entreprises...) et des services mis à leur disposition.

And he added this:

As members of Parliament, we have to ask ourselves very seriously, not facetiously, but as responsible people, if there is really inflation in Canada. Is there an excess of services offered to people, is there an excess of potatoes, tomatoes, pork, milk, butter, cheese?

In the same speech to the House, the hon. member for Bellechasse pointed out the increase in the national debt since 1867: \$30 billion to October 1, 1973, and \$58 billion to July 1, 1974. Realizing that situation of constantly heavier indebtedness, one can easily understand that the problems which confront the government are mostly money problems. This makes it that much more difficult to understand why supposedly competent administrators are still hesitating about making the required changes in the monetary system which is the cause of most of the difficulties we are encountering.

Repeatedly, at the House, I have said that any progress in our productivity should bring in dividends to the shareholders of Canada, the Canadians. To that end, the government should, on behalf of the company, issue and distribute new money to finance new activities.

But when the financing of progress is left to the banks which loan with interest, the credit so created, progress, can do nothing other financially than become a debt.

We have reached the stage where we no longer hear of the possibility of paying back the debt of the country, too high a percentage of the incomes being used to pay off the interest that amounts to over \$1 billion a year.

The government of the country does exactly what the law normally prevents any citizen from doing—not to pay his debts. Our learned politicians can claim they are knowledgeable but they seem to forget that the modern monetary system is first a system of accountancy and that the first quality to be expected of it is the exactness of the volume of credit in circulation. Since this credit is the means of payment, it is clear that it must bear some relation to the goods available. We borrow in 1975 to pay for debts made several years ago. Of all the dictatorships enumerated in history, of all those at least which have effects today, the most important is certainly the dictatorship of money. The moment a country enters civilization, it comes under the domination of the financial dictator. And this kind of dictatorship made more victims, imposed more deprivations, caused more sufferings, washed away more talents and broke more homes than any other.

It caused more moral and material ruins than any war, however disastrous in history. Parties that follow one another to power do not change the situation. The government seems to exist for the sole purpose of enforcing taxation, restrictions and hardships, even though our country has all the required resources for everyone to live at ease.

The same monetary policy is imposed by the same system to the leaders of whatever party. It does not mean that financiers invented political parties, not at all. But once political parties were established with election funds, meagre at first, then replenished by the protégés of public contracts financiers saw this as an excellent means to