

the benefits and the salaries the elementary school teachers received.

However, what did the board do? The board said it recognized the relationship, but that the teachers are not going to get the money. What this amounts to is a flat contradiction of the white paper, and I am glad to see that some Liberals are nodding their heads in agreement. I hope they make a speech on that point.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: Not only does the government bring in an unfair and unworkable program in terms of the white paper, the legislation which followed it and its implementation through the Anti-Inflation Board, but the board also makes decisions which are completely inconsistent with the framework the government itself has established.

The program is bad. I will not repeat arguments I and my colleagues have made about it being unworkable.

An hon. Member: We are tired of it.

Mr. Broadbent: I can see the point. The hon. member says he has heard enough. I am not going to repeat those arguments. I say to the hon. member that just as long as hon. members opposite occupy the other side of the House, unfortunately we will have to continue to repeat the message, and our proposals will not be implemented as long as they are over there.

Mr. Korchinski: He doesn't have a speech. He doesn't know what to say.

Mr. Broadbent: This program is wrong because it is unfair and unworkable for reasons I, and other members of my party, have documented since the bill was first introduced. It is wrong in terms of its own detail, but more important, in terms of the national problem of inflation. It is wrong because it does not address itself in a positive way to bringing forth programs which would deal with housing prices, energy prices, and food prices. It is in these three sectors where inflation has occurred in Canada, and there has been no debate in the House in that regard.

I find it extraordinary that for the whole period of time we have discussed Bill C-73 there has been nothing from the government side to the effect that in the last three years 65 per cent of our inflation has occurred in housing, food costs, and energy. I have not heard hon. members opposite tell us what the government would like to do with regard to those three items. Instead the government brought in a program which is primary in its effects, and every economist says that. It is going to be solely aimed at wage and salary earners. One might say that perhaps wage and salary earners are the problem.

If anything could justify the government's 180 degree about turn since July, 1974, it would be to be able to establish its case that wage and salary increases now are the main culprits in terms of inflation. The fact is that statistics have not been brought forward. The government has produced no evidence to show that wage and salary increases are the cause of inflation. I say it has not because it knows it cannot bring out the evidence. It does not exist.

Anti-Inflation Act

If you look at the OECD reports or the figures issued by Statistics Canada, wage and salary increases have been running behind the increases in the cost of living. The governor of the Bank of Canada and others have said that, but the minister does not attempt to deal with the argument.

● (2130)

On the other hand in terms of our trade position, that other whipping boy of the government, it says we will price ourselves out of world markets. The evidence does not support the government's case that when compared with other trading nations we are pricing ourselves out of world markets. Our major trading partners have wage and salary increases exceeding those in Canada.

The government cannot justify its program. It bears directly on wage and salary earners, but the evidence in Canada is that wage and salary earners in this country are not having increases disproportionate to those of other trading countries. In terms of domestic inflation, wage and salary earners have been following the increases in the cost of living, principally in food, housing, and energy. They have not caused the increase.

The government brought its program to the people of Canada and I suggest the reason was that just before Thanksgiving Day the former minister of finance decided to pack it all in. God knows his reasons, and I am not going to speculate on them. The people of Canada have been asking for leadership. They have said, "Where is this man who was elected in July, 1974, who said that only the Liberals would provide the leadership?" Even the Liberals, with a majority, began to sense that 99 per cent of the people of Canada were unhappy. It finally got through—from July, 1974, to September, 1975. So the Prime Minister said, "We had better do something. Turner has packed it in and the people are unhappy, so we had better come through with a symbolic act. We cannot do a War Measures Act again because the people of Quebec are not causing the trouble they were five years ago." Even though that was a grotesque injustice then, it had a symbolic flair. So he brought out a program that will not affect corporate decision-making in this country one iota.

He wants the American economy to bail us out. It will take off in the next 12 months and we will get the spin-off effects in employment and inflation. He said, "Let's hook up to a program that will not affect corporate decision-making but will bear directly on wage and salary earners." He made a symbolic appearance on television telling the people it is time to make sacrifices. He thought it really looked as if it had substance to it. In my judgment it is a hoax of a program; it is entirely a political gesture, and apart from the control of wages and salaries it has no economic substance at all. Once again the Liberal party is gambling on the Americans to bail us out.

I want to conclude with one further observation, Mr. Speaker. The major organized opponents of this legislation outside the House of Commons have been the trade union movement. In my view they have been absolutely right in their perspective. The program exempts corporations from any effective control of their prices, and consumers all across the country know this. The unions have been right in saying this. In my opinion they have also been right in