

Price Stability

countries of the western world: Norway, 0.6 per cent; Germany, 0.5 per cent—in other words, half of 1 per cent—Holland, 0.9 per cent; New Zealand, 1.3 per cent; Australia, 1.4 per cent; Denmark, 1.6 per cent; Sweden, 1.9 per cent.

In the United Kingdom, the country the minister said had experienced a cost of living rise greater than that in Canada, the unemployment rate in 1969 was 2.2 per cent. In Finland the rate was 2.3 per cent; in Italy, 3.1 per cent; in Belgium, 3.3 per cent; in the United States 4.1 per cent. In Canada—I hope the minister is paying attention—the rate was at 4.6 per cent, the highest of all those countries. Is it any wonder that the leaders of the two major labour federations have rejected the government's policies?

There are reasons other than those involving unemployment that lie behind the rejection. I suggest, first, that those organizations have rejected the government's policies because those policies would inevitably, as I have already said, lead to more unemployment. The Prime Minister himself called for higher unemployment when he said he was not afraid of a 6 per cent unemployment rate. Secondly, the government's policies of restraint give no protection to poor people who are working for very low wages, who have fixed incomes, who receive pensions or welfare payments and who are locked for various reasons to fixed incomes. There is no protection for them in the government's policies of restraint.

Thirdly and most importantly, the government's policy of restraint ignores all sources of income but wages. I have challenged the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission again and again, as I challenge the minister, to give one illustration showing that the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission has ever called on any group except the working people, has ever called on any organization such as the Canadian Manufacturers Association, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association or any similar organization, to show the kind of restraint which it is demanded that leaders of labour ask their members to show.

May I talk about some of the groups I have just mentioned. Representatives of the medical profession attending the conference of which the minister speaks about so proudly said that profession would not raise its fees. Why shouldn't they agree not to raise their fees? Has any group in Canada enjoyed a

[Mr. Orlikow.]

greater bonanza than the medical profession has enjoyed in the last couple of years as a result of medicare plans and being able to collect all fees for all the work done? And those fees have been increased.

If the minister wants to see it, I can show him proof that the doctors in my province, Manitoba, have increased their fee schedules in the last two years by over 50 per cent. Has any group of workers increased its pay rates by anything close to 50 per cent in that period? Certainly the doctors offered to hold the line. Having stolen the horse, they are now prepared to lock the barn door. The same thing goes for engineers. Allow me to cite some more examples, Mr. Speaker.

The *Globe and Mail* in February of this year carried a report prepared by H. V. Chapman and Associates Ltd. on the percentage of executives who earned more than \$20,000 in salaries and bonuses. Their incomes in 1969 rose by 9 percentage points over their incomes for 1968, and in 1967 and 1966 there were similar increases. In other words, in those four years executive incomes rose by 40 per cent. I did not hear the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission lecturing the presidents of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce or the Canadian Manufacturers Association and urging them to hold the line on executive salaries.

The University of Toronto professors obtained a unilateral pay increase, as announced on April 25 of this year, for next year of 10 per cent. The professors at York University obtained an increase for next year of 14 per cent. I am not suggesting this is too much, but I have not heard any appeals on the part of the government or the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission to presidents of Canadian universities asking them to hold the line.

Let us also look at the salaries of the top civil servants, the people who are giving advice to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The salary of the governor of the Bank of Canada was recently increased from \$50,000 a year to \$75,000 a year.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Hold the line!

Mr. Orlikow: The government keeps as much of this sort of thing as possible secret, but I presume that along with the \$25,000 increase in salary the governor of the bank obtained a comparable increase in his pension benefits. When the governor of the Bank of