

Increased Cost of Living

suggesting for quite a length of time that a compensated discount be granted at the retail level, following an agreement between a national commission and Canadian retailers whereby prices would not change. This would be an agreement not an imposition. Everyone is free to join or not. But if you join, then the government would order the payment of a 25 per cent compensated discount on retail prices, which means that for a \$100 purchase the consumer would pay \$75 and the government \$25 as compensated discount to the retailer. The retailer would have \$100 and inflation and price increases would thus be efficiently controlled. But no. Yesterday, the Prime Minister asked me whether that was constitutional or not; to my mind, he did not know whether the matter was constitutional or not. It seems to me we should look into it.

Indeed, I wonder what is keeping the Canadian parliament, which is sovereign, from passing a law to adopt a compensated discount, as was done anyway during the war in the case of milk.

Mr. Speaker, that is no miracle solution but a very normal one. Why does the government hesitate to try it out? What is it waiting for? Why speak of freezing prices which would lead right away to a black market? Why not try the solution advocated by the Social Credit party?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: this is no miracle solution. The member for York South spoke of increasing the income of low wage earners. He is against price control. He has not always been against it, but now he is. I think that he has heard us often enough to reach this conclusion.

A price freeze is no good, really no good. They suggest increasing the income of workers, those who are drawing a small income. But how are we to increase this income? The hon. member has failed to explain. He has not referred to it.

I am going to tell you how. You must take from the haves and give to the have nots. That is the way to increase the income of the poor, that is the socialist solution.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian who earns \$25,000, \$50,000, \$75,000 or \$100,000 a year does not hide his money in a corner of his bedroom. He spends it, he buys things, he opens a business or something similar. His money is used for something, this is not saving. So, they are going to take it from him and give it to somebody who has less money. The total revenue remains exactly the same; the total national revenue will still amount to \$70 billion and they will not be able to purchase the \$32 billion worth of goods which are on the shelves, in stores, in warehouses, in sheds, in back stores as we call them. To take from the rich to give to the poor will not solve anything.

The hon. member for York South stated that his solution would be wage control. This is exactly what I have just said. If you have the chance to make money, the government will watch you and take it away. Thus, private enterprise is killed, the stimulus which drives someone to do something. He is discouraged and then he says: If I have to work for the government, I will give up. This is what happens in private industry. So the solution of the New Democratic Party is not effective.

As far as we are concerned, we say that we should make up the difference between production and national income

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

at current prices, paying at first a compensated discount and then distributing a national dividend to every citizen. This is a solution.

Mr. Speaker, whatever may be said, whether it seems ridiculous or funny, as long as those solutions are rejected, we will continue to beat around the bush. We will always be considering absurd motions as the one introduced today and far-fetched solutions which do not solve anything but create worse problems.

Mr. Speaker, the Creditists are continuing to instil these principles into Canadians so that the products will be available to the Canadian people and allow them to be their own masters.

● (1640)

[English]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles)—Unemployment Insurance—Commission policy respecting unemployed agricultural workers seeking benefits; the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose)—Post Office—Steps to increase compensation of rural mail delivery contractors; the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Blenkarn)—Canada Development Corporation—Request for tabling of details of appraisal of Polymer for sale to Corporation.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO TAKE EFFECTIVE ACTION TO DEAL WITH INCREASED COST OF LIVING

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Gillies (for Mr. Baldwin):

That this House deplores the failure of the government to take concrete and effective action against the rising cost of living, so evident in the price of shelter, food and clothing; and therefore urges the government to impose an immediate temporary freeze so as to enable it to develop a satisfactory plan in conjunction with the provinces, industry and labour for the purpose of keeping the cost of living within acceptable limits.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today we directed questions to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) to try to establish exactly what the government policy is in this critical area of