

*Increased Cost of Living*

income groups, be they in particular areas or belonging to certain social categories, benefit by government expenditures or tax reduction, so that the disparity we regret so deeply may be reduced and that the general distribution of income may be more equitable.

Our efforts, Mr. Speaker, must therefore be continued in order to increase that equality of income in our society. But I do not believe we can say at any given moment that the government made no efforts to increase such equality or reduce the inequality everybody thinks so unfortunate. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the amendment moved by the New Democratic Party. First, because this amendment concerns a problem that does not exist anymore, except on the surface, price increases in some areas which are being dealt with by a joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate; second, because this amendment is based theoretically on an analysis of inflation which, by no means, can be accepted by someone who accepts conventional economic theories; and, finally, because from that standpoint, this government certainly has a record that can be favourably compared with that of any other previous government.

[*English*]

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to many interesting speeches and many differences of opinion on the question of whether the amendment of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) should have been discussed at this time. I am one of those who believe that if a person sincerely believes in something, he has a right to raise it, because he is answerable to himself and his conscience and should not be criticized for so doing.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam because I believe few problems today are of more urgent concern to the average Canadian than the steadily spiralling cost of living. This trend has continued during the last three years. I am not blaming the government for this situation, but would point out that in 1962 President Kennedy said that no country in the world managed its economy so well as Canada.

I think we must look back over the record and study this problem. As the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam suggests in his amendment, we should study this matter very carefully, because something has gone wrong. We must find the answer to the problem. It is

[Mr. Tremblay.]

all right to say that this government has introduced many social reform measures. I could ask that they be listed but the list would not be impressive. But this is not the problem we are discussing; we are discussing the problem of spiralling consumer prices, which has caught almost everyone. Let us remember, however, that this situation has most seriously affected those people living on fixed incomes; the old age pensioners, those in receipt of mother's allowance, the disabled, the blind, our veterans and those living on annuities.

As a doctor, I have visited some of these people in their homes and know how they are penalized and punished by the rising cost of living. It is all very well to say that the government enacted the Canada Assistance Act, but the other day I wanted to use the provisions of this act and found it was not operating in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam pointed out that from 1957 to 1965 the wastage of our productive capacity amounted to \$21 billion.

• (4:30 p.m.)

This is an astonishing figure, but I do not doubt the accuracy of his figures. It means that in Canada, over that period of time there has been a per capita loss of \$1,200. For every man, woman and child. I contend that we should look into this matter and try to find some solution to correct it. I also strongly believe something should be attempted to tie wages to productivity. Perhaps it is not practical to do so, but I do not see why in this day and age we have to have strike after strike with the resulting unsettlement and difficulties not only to the working people but to those who have nothing to do with it but are victims nevertheless. Surely, we could reach a point at which the increases in wages should be tied to our productivity. This has to be done if we are to keep our competitive position in the world. These strikes do not bring any advantage to anyone. I am sure that most of my labour friends will agree with me that strikes are becoming, seriously outdated. I know many working people who take pride in their work, in the machinery with which they work, and in the factory in which they are employed. They would no more want to hurt that factory any more than they would hurt themselves because they feel a loyalty to it. Surely, it is time we devised a system which would do away with those crippling strikes.

A statement was made in the house earlier, and I studied it carefully, that in the early days wages did not keep up with our increasing productivity and increasing profits. If we