

Anti-Inflation Policies

apparently uses as a yardstick for the degree of unemployment that the government considers acceptable the recession that was inherited by the Diefenbaker administration when it took office in 1957. To me it is amazing that the Minister of Finance does not go back further and use as a yardstick for acceptable unemployment, at least so far as the government is concerned, the days of R. B. Bennett.

Mr. Benson: You don't have to go back beyond 1961.

Mr. Coates: That is right, and what government was in office at that time? It was the Diefenbaker administration. Let me read some of the things that were written about the type of legacy it passed on to the Liberal administration in 1963. *Time* magazine said in 1962:

In the west, a fruitful half-billion bushel wheat crop was not only harvested but partly sold, and the Prairies again rejoiced in being the bread basket to a substantial part of the world.

That is a far different story from the one we hear today. In 1962 *Canadian Business* magazine had this to say:

A 12-nation comparison of retail price increases over the 12 months shows that Canada has been the most successful in keeping down the cost of living. The Canadian increase was just under one per cent.

That is something that could be recommended to the Minister of Finance—a cost of living increase of under 1 per cent.

The U.S. was only a shade more. Biggest increases were in France, Holland and the U.K. where the cost of living rose by over 5 per cent. In Germany and Sweden it rose by 4 per cent.

I am sure that today Canada must lead the world with respect to increases in the cost of living. Since the Minister of Finance likes to talk about the Diefenbaker administration, here is what the *Ottawa Citizen*, not usually known as a Conservative organ, reported on December 24, 1962:

During 1962, employment and labour income reached new highs.

That is a different story from the one we hear today about unemployment. In December, 1962, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce said:

Personal incomes have continued to expand in the wake of increased employment opportunities, higher rates of pay, and record levels of farm income.

That is a story far different from the one we hear today, but that was the legacy which the Diefenbaker administration passed on to the Liberal administration. The story we hear today is of a heartless government increasing

unemployment day in and day out, placing further loads on the backs of the underprivileged and the unemployed, yet it still cannot defeat inflation. The government continues to increase the hardship and the misery of the unemployed.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, this situation reminds me of Hollywood. We should no longer be in Ottawa. We should change the name of this institution. The government is changing everything else and it might as well change the name of this place and call it Hollywood Palace. The colours there are much better. We could have technicolour and cinemascope and we could have the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as the producer, director and main actor in the great scene. As we come into the chamber he would give us rose-coloured glasses. He and the Minister of Finance would stand up, and he would say, "Look around you, all 264 of you including the Speaker, and you will see that nobody is unemployed here". Everybody here is earning \$18,000 a year, and the ministers get twice as much and more. The Prime Minister has a large staff and every day he adds one or two people to it. The number now is 75 or 80 and this costs the taxpayers \$880,000 a year. Pretty soon we will be in trouble with the taxpayers, we will be in trouble in this institution, I will be in trouble in my office and there may be unemployment even in the civil service.

Mr. Speaker, it is an Alice in Wonderland world in which the government lives. It is a government which pays absolutely no attention to anyone except its own members. The Prime Minister looks in the mirror, like Alice, and talks to himself. He says, "Who is the fairest one of all", and the mirror says back to him, "You are, Trudy baby". Then he comes in the House, puts on his rose-coloured glasses and cannot understand why everybody in this chamber does not wear them too. There may not be any film in my camera, Mr. Speaker, but let me tell you that the Prime Minister sees that there is film in his camera. He even trips the light fantastic with Barbra Streisand. She is Funny Girl and he is funny boy. Let me tell you that it is not funny to the 500,000 or 600,000 unemployed people in this country.

Mr. Perrault: You are speaking in the House of Commons and you should use the proper language.

Mr. Coates: The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) is worried about lan-