will digress for a few moments before I continue with the article in the *Financial Post.*

In the area of the Bow River constituency in 1957, when I first became a candidate for parliament, there was unemployment in the coal mines of Drumheller and Canmore. The Liberal party was in power at that time and there was no work in either of those areas. It was only because of the efforts of this particular government in expanding the coal trade that men returned to employment.

This is just one item, in connection with coal from the areas of Canmore and the Crow's Nest pass in Alberta, when 500,000 tons of coal were sold to Japan. The miners in Canmore were not only able to hold their jobs in the winter but also in the summer. There was full employment in that area. That is just one example of what this government has done.

In the article in the *Financial Post* of February 18 Mr. Dalton Robertson says:

> There are here-and-there signs that spring may come early on the business front. More life in a growing number of indicators suggest that the bottom of the current recession may be very close indeed.

That is the kind of optimism I like to read. On what does he base those remarks? He says this with reference to some arguments as to what this government has done about the unemployment problem in this country:

> Housing starts are now staging a surprising comeback after a depressed performance throughout almost all of 1960. December starts were up fractionally from a year earlier, January starts were up an estimated 5 per cent—a big switcharound from the 21 per cent, 35 per cent, 24 per cent, 20 per cent, 28 per cent year-to-year declines in July, August, September, October and November, 1960.

He goes on to say that because of the housing situation there is now an economic comeback, and he says there is a sign that the recession low point has been reached. Then he goes on to say this:

> Business inventories as a whole give signs of being worked down healthily toward levels low enough to spark some new production.

In other words, he points out that the inventories of business are now at a low level, so they can go into full production. Those are the signs in business that show, it seems to me, the Canadian people and members of this house that there will be an improvement in the employment situation. This is because of action taken by the present government.

Mr. Dalton Robertson goes on to say:

> Industrial stock prices, usually a portent of things to come, continue on the upgrade. At mid-week, TSE industrials were still riding about 3 per cent above beginning of the year levels and 14 per cent higher than at their mid-summer 1960 low.

It would seem to me, reading this article in the *Financial Post,* that Dalton Robertson has faith in this country and is an optimist. I have always said, and I believe this, that if one business has confidence in another business, if industry of one kind has confidence in industry of another kind, that breeds confidence in the whole of the economy and in that way, with a healthy business throughout the country, we can obtain full employment.

The opposition points today in a critical way to the monetary policies of this government. Let me ask them this question. Did the monetary policy of the Canadian government create unemployment in the United States? After all, I think we cannot overlook these facts. The economy of this country, whether we like it or not, is somewhat tied to the economy of the United States. When they have prosperity, we have prosperity; when they have a recession, we have a recession. After all, because of our geographic situation, because of our ties economically with that country—and this is something that has occurred over the years and has been going on since the time of confederation; it is not something new—we must face the that that as goes the economy of the United States, so goes the economy of Canada. When the opposition points and criticizes and blames the monetary policies of this government and says they are the cause of unemployment, how do they explain unemployment in the United States? It seems to me that when we talk about unemployment there are a few facts we should take into consideration.

Mr. Winch: On that phase of the argument, would the hon. member tell us what is the relationship in percentage terms of the volume of unemployment in Canada compared with the labour force as against the unemployment figure in the United States compared with the labour force?

Mr. Woolliams: I have not got the exact figures, but I may say that I think the hon. member's question is a fair one. I think the figures from the United States show that the percentage is less, but it depends on how those figures are made up—whether, for example, the unemployment figure includes married women who have ceased to work and who are drawing unemployment insurance. From the figures I have read, I would say the percentage is a little less, but, as I say, it depends on how the United States figures are composed.

To return to what I was saying, it seems to me that it is not primarily the monetary policy which affects unemployment. We should look at trade itself, and at the relationship between management and labour.