

The Address—Mr. Noseworthy

and then another with the lending institutions, but when he issues regulations he does not know whether the lending institutions are going to accept them. It is not the government which decides just what regulations will be binding upon the building industry; it is the lending institutions which have the final say. The minister brings down a series of regulations, and if the lending institutions refuse to adopt them the minister has no other recourse under the policy the government is following but to adjust his regulations to suit the lending institutions. I asked the minister a week ago whether the lending institutions had agreed to accept the terms which he stated in the house would apply to building, and his reply was that the government was still negotiating with the lending institutions. Nearly a month after the minister had issued his regulations he was still negotiating with the lending institutions to discover whether or not they would accept them, and the minister has not yet told us whether or not the lending institutions are accepting the terms which he laid down. Is it not about time that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, a government institution, should be controlled to some extent at least by the government which created it instead of being left so completely at the mercy of lending institutions?

I have another criticism which I am going to pass on to the minister for what it is worth. I do not know personally the president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I have met him and discussed a few matters with him, but I do not know the man or his capabilities. However, dozens of builders have told me that what we need at the head of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation today is a builder, not an insurance man. I am passing that on to the minister, not as my own comment but as the comment of practical builders who are struggling in the field with the problem of building houses. Whether or not there is any need for that the minister knows better than I.

There is one other matter I want to touch on briefly, the subject of unemployment in Ontario and particularly around Toronto.

An hon. Member: And Windsor.

Mr. Noseworthy: Windsor is in Ontario and not Saskatchewan.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Good.

Mr. Noseworthy: I made the statement in the house earlier this session that the government's policy for combating inflation could only result in unduly increased inventories,

cut-backs in production, lay-offs and three or four day work weeks in numerous centres throughout Ontario. I based that statement on trends I had observed when I visited many of the industrial centres of Ontario before the commencement of this session. Two months ago I saw numerous plants that were operating three and four days a week, numerous plants that were laying off help because inventories were piling up, plants that were reducing production; and all this at a time when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) is telling us that the thing we need to get us out of inflation is more production. The Minister of Finance goes out and calls upon the industrial workers of this country to produce more. Liberal members of the house have been heard to voice criticism of the forty-hour week and to wonder what the country is coming to when industrial workers insist on working only forty hours a week. There is a situation where tens of thousands of workers cannot work any hours during the week, cannot find jobs, cannot work forty hours a week. Some of them are forced to be content with three or four days a week at a time when we are supposed to be spending \$5 billion over a three year period on defence production, when we are supposed to need every possible man we can find for defence production. At the same time one of the ministers, I have forgotten which, told us not so long ago that we were not going to have the men and materials to do this and that, that Canadians would be required to reduce their standard of living and do without many of the things they have been accustomed to having. Yet at such a time, as a direct result of government policy, we have more unemployed in the city of Toronto than we had in February, 1950, before the Korean campaign. There is more unemployment than we had during those days when we were debating the unemployment situation and wondering what was ahead of us. Then Korea saved us from that grave unemployment situation.

There is a report of the Ontario section of the national employment service, a summary of which was published in the *Globe and Mail* on November 17. It indicates that the number of unemployed in Ontario today is 50 per cent higher than it was a year ago. It indicates that unemployment exists in furniture plants, rubber plants, textile factories, firms turning out materials for house construction, and that even skilled machinists are in excess of demand today. What kind of government policy have we that produces such results at a time like this? Why in the world should skilled machinists be unable to