

Anti-Inflation Program

comment further on that aspect at the present time. However, I will say it is transparently obvious that the S.O.S. has gone out from the Province of British Columbia. The situation of the government there is desperate. They have said to their colleagues here, "Help us out; we have only got until the 11th and we've got to do something." And so we have a motion before us today.

I felt other speakers would have raised some of the points I have made this afternoon but I realize that British Columbia is a long, long way from this chamber, and unfortunately many of my colleagues from that province are not present this afternoon. In these circumstances I felt somewhat constrained to provide some background because we shall be voting on this motion later. The leader of our party has already indicated that he is not prepared to support the motion, and I feel that if I have done anything in the brief minutes at my disposal I have said some of the things that needed to be said. Although I realize I could go on a little longer, I yield the floor now with the record a little straighter as to why this unusual motion should have been presented at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Reading this motion, Madam Speaker, one might ask whether the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) in whose name it stands has read the white paper issued by the government on October 14. He told us the government's anti-inflation program was totally unworkable in terms of controlling prices. That remains to be seen. He said it provides no effective control over profits or professional incomes. I should like the leader of the NDP to read pages 16, 17, 18 and part of 19, and then tell me why he believes there is no effective control over prices or professional incomes.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Because he has read those pages, that is why.

Mr. Breau: I did not hear anything in his speech today to convince me that this kind of system cannot work. I shall have something to say a little later about controlling prices. He maintained that the program was unfair to wage and salary earners in Canada. That is one aspect I wish to deal with this afternoon because when people talk about wage and salary earners they normally think about unions, the labour movement, and workers generally.

It has always amazed me that the NDP, a party which until the last election had never succeeded in electing a single member east of the Ottawa Valley—they have got one now and, knowing his background, I hope he will be able to bring the party to reality and show them that when they talk about people, and when they talk about workers, they should not talk only about labour unions and giving the people who rule them more power in the economy—

An hon. Member: Right out of the ocean.

Mr. Breau: Because of my background, and because of what has interested me in politics, I am concerned with people, particularly with those who are the weakest, those with low incomes, and I must say that, apart from rhetoric, since I entered this House in 1968, and apart from supporting some social programs which do help the little people in

[Mr. Johnston.]

society, on the question of wages or salaries the NDP is not the only party, not necessarily the sole bright light in fighting for those who are weak.

I understand that when one comes from a certain constituency one tends to speak in terms of the interests of those constituents. I remember the crusade the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) carried on in 1970, 1971, and 1972 against the Department of Regional Economic Expansion when that department was just starting out; he would look for cases involving incentives in the Atlantic provinces and elsewhere and try to dramatize them and exaggerate them without giving the program any kind of a chance. Because it was popular with the UAW and popular with workers in Toronto and some other areas close to his constituency, he carried on his crusade against that program.

• (1620)

Mr. Broadbent: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order. Is the hon. member rising to ask a question or to raise a point of order?

Mr. Broadbent: I hope that the hon. member will correct the impression that he has just left.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. That is clearly a point for debate, not a point of order.

Mr. Broadbent: Madam Speaker, I had not yet come to my point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the hon. member rising again on a second point of order?

Mr. Broadbent: I should like to express the first point of order. My point is that motives ought not be attributed to members of the House on either side. The hon. member was attributing motives to things I have said in the past, which I submit is out of order. Secondly, if he checks the record of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion he will discover that his own minister acknowledged the errors in the program to which I drew attention. The point he made about the motives behind the objection is of the kind that I would not have expected of a man with his experience in the House.

Mr. Breau: Madam Speaker, first of all I totally and categorically reject the suggestion that I attributed motives. I was reflecting on the reason why the hon. member would normally take a certain stand on a particular program of the government. I agree that in some cases the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has not been a total success.

Mr. Broadbent: In every case I cited they have not.

Mr. Breau: The irony of the situation is that the particular case that the hon. member dramatized and exaggerated, the Michelin case, has been the most successful part of DREE. The hon. member is a national party leader so I will give him a chance since he is just starting out. If he were up to date he would know exactly what the problems of