

*Unemployment*

for one moment that I know more than the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe), but I am suggesting we should push this thing, and push it hard.

There is another thing would happen if we did that. I think we would gain parity on our dollar more quickly; and the sooner we gain that parity the sooner our international trade will appreciate. We have had this favourable dollar value, and while it is something I am very proud of—it is easy to be proud of the fact that our dollar value is high—I do not believe it is something that is making us a lot of money. I do not think it is making us money; I think it is losing us money.

There is another thing I have heard talked about until, quite frankly, it has made me somewhat ill, although this may be because I come from an urban riding. I am referring to the question of farm price supports. I can understand farmers being given and taking price supports as a palliative, as an emergency measure. But surely I am not reading the minds of members of the C.C.F. party correctly when I am led to the conclusion that they want a broad program of price supports, and to continue it indefinitely. Surely it is not sound economy to have price supports for those in agriculture who continue endlessly to produce something for which there is no market. That is not sound business.

I recognize, and I think any sensible person must recognize, that if you are to have a prosperous country then the farmer must be prosperous. But surely we are not going to make the mistake the United States made for so many years, when they put in supports for things that the country could not possibly consume, and ended up with a surplus they just do not know what to do with and which they have a tendency to dump on world markets to the detriment of our international trade in agricultural products.

Surely that is not what they mean. Because, if it is, they are not thinking clearly. I agree with this procedure as an emergency procedure, but not as a long-term measure. That could not be the intention or the considered plan of any sensible government. Surely that is not what they are after. If they are, then they only confirm my opinion of their party.

**Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain):** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Hunter:** I do not wish to have any questions at the moment. I would like the same privilege you have, namely that of continuing my speech. I know you have

never liked criticism, because you cannot take it. You never have been able to take it, and you never will be able to take it.

Now, I would like to mention housing, and the fact that we are catching up. I was told by one hon. member today that they are not catching up in Vancouver, and I am not in a position to dispute the fact. But I do know we are catching up in Toronto. Last year we built 12,000 units, and today expensive housing does not sell at all. They are trying to get rid of it. The demand is for cheaper housing, and we have a large number of family units coming into existence every year. There will be a large and continuing market for cheaper housing, and when I say that I mean housing cheaper than it is today. Right now in many cases it is too expensive for the wage returns of the individuals concerned.

However, I do not for one moment suggest that housing is on the decline. I do say, though, that we certainly should be able to produce houses for about \$11,000 or \$12,000, which means moderate payments for persons earning moderate wages. Because when you get over that price you reach the point where you are not providing housing for the people who need to purchase it, and your market will go down.

It would be even better if we could provide houses for \$10,000, and it may be that in certain parts of the country that can be done. At the moment, however, it is not being done in Toronto. In that city the cheaper housing subdivisions are going well, but they are going much more slowly than they did two years ago. The answer is that more of the people who have been able to afford these houses have been able to purchase them, and the market has gone down.

In connection with housing I do not think anybody could deny the importance of that industry, because there are more people employed in it than in probably any other industry in the country. There are more building products being used which, in turn, tend to provide employment in a myriad of different industries. And for us to do anything stupid in connection with housing which would give us a flood of houses which, in the end, would result in a decline in sales over five or ten years, would be a singularly stupid policy. But that is the policy my hon. friends of the C.C.F. would implement without the slightest hesitation.

In connection with housing I would make this further statement, that there are very few communities in Canada that have had the wisdom of my own city in starting slum clearance; and when I say that I am not