

Trudeau) the government's 180-degree turn on prices and income control. All of us on this side recall the way in which the Prime Minister and his cohorts vilified the leader of the opposition in the course of the 1974 campaign and made scurrilous comments about price and income controls. They turned up their noses and turned down their thumbs at the suggestion there should be a dialogue between the government, labour, management and the provinces. Then, as all Canadians know, late in 1975 the Prime Minister sired a monster which is so insensitive, a child of the government, that it is now called the AIB, which is an excuse for another name. This organization now has more staff than was employed in the United States on a similar program despite the vastly larger population of that country.

I have listened to the speeches of hon. members on the other side of the House. I have heard them say repeatedly that we do not offer new ideas. Obviously they do not listen to what is said over here, or they do not read *Hansard*. The idea of controlling inflation had nothing to do with original thinking within the Liberal stronghold. The Anti-Inflation Board today is something like an English sports car I used to drive. I always maintained that the engineers who designed that car did everything the hard way. That is precisely how the AIB operates. It employs twice the bureaucracy it needs—if that is an employment strategy, the Board is certainly serving its purpose. But in my view it is employing people who lack the necessary expertise to enable them to do the job. If the expertise were there, the Board would probably get along with half its present staff.

One of the most serious problems facing Canadians in the field of restraint has not even been scanned. I refer to the outflow of Canadian dollars spent on goods purchased in the United States. When I returned to my constituency last week I noticed that the cars in my home town of Trail were covered with flyers from a store. I had a look at them. They were from a store in Colville, Washington, an IGA operation, and they were advertising food at half the price Canadians would have to pay in Trail, Ottawa or Halifax. Where were the owners of those cars on Armistice Day? Were they at the Cenotaph? No, sir. Thousands of them were streaming into the United States to spend Canadian dollars on American products at one-third the price of those products in Canada: for example, chicken at 39 cents a pound, when the chicken marketing board sets the price at 69 cents a pound in British Columbia. How can a merchant hope to compete with that?

● (1750)

I took the time to go down to the border and observe some of the people crossing, and I talked to them. I do not blame them for going into the United States to make their purchases; I do not blame them one bit. But when an aluminum window-frame comes across that border at a price of \$81.25 and the same item in Trail costs \$250, there is something wrong with the economy of this nation. That is a direct reflection on the business approach and conduct of this government. They don't know where it's at. I watched cars coming through that border with trailers carrying furniture, shelves for kitchen cupboards

and household goods which people could clearly have bought in Trail but at three times the price. Is it the merchants that are gouging? The merchants are doing their best to compete with those in the United States, but they have not got a chance.

I should like to proceed further along this line of thought, Mr. Speaker, but I have noticed the odd rumbling from the other side. I wonder whether, in deference to Your Honour, at this hour I may call it six o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must confess that I have had some indication that the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) seeks the floor on a point of order, and this time works out to be extremely propitious.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Because of the seriousness of the discussion that took place shortly following the question period, I had an opportunity a few moments ago to examine the blues and to see there, in black and white, so to speak, that during the exchange that took place on the point of order following the question period, in my frustration and anxiety I did impute motivation to the Chair that I very much regret.

I should like both to apologize to the Chair and to retract any suggestion of motivation or that the Chair was not impartial. I believe, sir, as one member of this House, that it is important that all of us realize that you are, in effect, the impartial servant of us all and seek in your own way to ensure that this House operates not only to serve the members with total impartiality but obviously directly and in justice to the people generally. I do apologize to Your Honour both for the remarks themselves, and also to hon. members for the time of the House that was taken up on the matter. I trust that it will not occur again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A more complete and dignified retraction of what has to be considered an unfortunate outburst would not be possible, I am sure, in the opinion of any member. Certainly the matter is now closed, except to say that the hon. member, in expressing his regret at the particular language, did not say just a moment ago that which he might have said, and that is that while the concern about the particular language that he used has now been adequately expressed, his frustration and the frustration of other members in respect to similar occurrences is none the less.

Indeed, I think that one of the abiding strengths of this chamber is that when these frustrations do occur we have to keep open our channels of communication in order that they can be expressed. Indeed, it is important not only to the members but to the nation that members on both sides of this House be able to do battle with each other. That is, after all, what we came here for. When these frustrations do occur, as they do quite regularly, I think we have to cope with them as best we can and make sure that we are open to communication, so that our frustrations can be properly aired and under-