

*Unemployment*

some construction scheme in the wilds of Canada. I think it must be recognized that the privileges which unionism has won for labour make for less and less mobility in our labour force. I am not criticizing that; I am just saying it is a fact.

No matter how many of these public works programs you start there will definitely be a large number of employables in Canada who will be in a position where they may consider it unwise to accept such employment somewhere else while there is any hope of getting back into the employment they formerly had. These are problems which I think many people fail to take into consideration when considering the mobility of labour. It is true that immigration has a tendency to supply a fairly mobile labour force. However they, in turn, as soon as they gain the same privileges and rights, fit into the picture I have just described.

Similarly in a free enterprise—and I sincerely hope this will always be a free enterprise, as free as it can be without hurting people—there can be no compulsion. I do not think a Canadian government—possibly my friends in the C.C.F. party will disagree with me—would ever compel people to take jobs somewhere else when they do not want to go there. This is the Russian system, and I have no doubt there may be some people of that mind in this house, but personally I sincerely pray there are not many.

**Mr. Knowles:** Many of our people are under economic compulsion now.

**Mr. Hunter:** My friend here says there are lots of them. In looking at some of those people down there I must say that perhaps he is right.

Another thing these people have, and it is something that has grown up imperceptibly, is the prosperity of the workingman, generally speaking. Today there is a widespread tendency toward home ownership under the National Housing Act and various other schemes. When a workman, or anybody for that matter, has purchased a home, has an equity in it and has grown to love it, you have one more thing that prevents him from being part of a mobile labour force. He does not wish to leave his home. He does not wish to leave his neighbours. As our economy becomes more prosperous—and we have a very prosperous economy, though there will be some defects in any economy—then more people will want to own their own homes. They will love their homes and will definitely not want to move around the country. They may be forced by economic circumstances to move, but it is not something they are going to do easily.

[Mr. Hunter.]

I have heard it suggested, mainly by the socialist group in this house, that we should make homes more readily available, that the down payments should be made very low. Possibly they have not appreciated what has been happening under the veterans' housing administration in the United States. There under certain circumstances a veteran can walk into a home without paying a cent, not even the legal fees. The administration is greatly worried about it, because the veterans are treating these homes as a rental proposition. They have no stake in them. They walk in and out as though they were rooming houses, and they do not care how they treat them. I do not think any sensible people in the C.C.F. party—and I hope there are more than I think—would believe we should allow people to walk into a house without making a substantial down payment. Some of them talk as though every man were entitled to a home. He is entitled to exactly what he is willing to work for.

Another thing I think our government could do—I am not suggesting our government is perfect or that any other government is perfect—would be to push international trade a little harder. I know that is agreeing with something the Conservative party has been saying for a long time, but I do not agree with the way they have put it. They are thinking only in terms of the United Kingdom, and I am thinking in terms of the world. I am convinced that if we put more trade officials around the world, in every conceivable place, in the long run they would more than earn their salaries. That is just what England used to do. They put people all over the world. They picked up a hundred thousand here or a million there. In the individual case it might not have been much, but in the aggregate it was very great.

Recently I had the privilege of visiting the Republic of Haiti, and it seems we had \$2,600,000 worth of trade down there, without lifting a finger. I am told we buy \$15,000 worth of goods from them. Probably we buy a little more indirectly, in the shape of goods that come to the United States for processing and then come up here. Also I was told by a government official down there that if we had a trade attaché in Haiti we could easily increase our trade by at least a third in two years. Perhaps that is not much, a third of \$2,600,000; but if you took every country and every community in the world and increased trade to that extent, then I am convinced that before long Canada would be the greatest trading nation in the world. And I am convinced people's salaries down there would be just a fleabite compared to what the country would gain. I am not suggesting