

unpleasant as possible. There were more than one although I think one man could have done the job. One of these men said, and I have it in writing, "Remember we are working for the largest employer in the world, so don't try to buck us." If the small businessmen of this country have to put up with this kind of thing it is time that somebody took a sawed-off shotgun and started to work.

If we stop to consider when the war ended—this is utter nonsense. Why should we have to put up with this kind of thing. Small business is being pushed to the wall as fast as possible. For goodness sake, let us get back to normal. Let the law of supply and demand hold sway. My prediction is that the shrewd housewife will regulate her purchases so that the pendulum will soon swing back to normal.

I should like to say a further word in connection with a group of veterans to whom reference was made in this house the other day. The minister made the statement that some relief was being given in connection with rental controls and I asked about the veteran who could not get possession of his house. I was told that it did not matter what class of tenant was in the house, he could not get it. The minister said that if the house had been bought between November, 1944 and July, 1945, the owner could not get possession. He then went on to say that the owner could go before the rental appeal court and endeavour to show that his need was greater than that of the tenant. I think anyone who knows anything about these rental appeal courts will agree with me when I say that I do not know where any great change has been made in a decision of a rentals officer by the rental control judge reviewing the case. If there are any cases, I should like to know of them. I do not know of any and I know that many cases have been reviewed. The owner will have to prepare a case; he will have to hire a lawyer and produce all kinds of evidence to show that he has more need than the person living in the house. There have been some caustic things said about that type of suggested regulation.

The minister says that there is no hope for the man who bought a house during that period. I know of many cases where the wife of a man has worked on victory shifts and saved two or three hundred dollars. Then the husband has sent home more; the father has helped and the mother has helped. A down payment was made on a little home perhaps in 1942, 1943 or 1944. The young man may have been fighting overseas for his life. Perhaps he went through Dunkirk, over

[Mr. Lockhart.]

Normandy or through the long grind in Sicily and Italy. He was not worrying about a house.

Then he came back home to his family who were thinking ahead of time in trying to have a place to which they could go. These homes were bought by the dozen. These men came back from an experience such as only those who went through it know about. They were discharged a year or a year and a half ago as the case may be and now they find that they cannot get possession of their little homes.

If the government does not see the need of extending these regulations to take in these young men, then I say it is doing a gross injustice to one type of veteran in this country. I urge the government to consider extending the regulations, so that these men may get their homes which were bought perhaps two or three years ago.

Finally, I again urge the government to abandon this present chaotic system of controls, and to devote their entire energies to producing food. Let them encourage the fruit and vegetable men by giving them all assistance possible to produce food for the starving world that we hear so much about. Let them take out of inactivity every available man—and the wartime prices and trade board is the most glaring example—and put them into active production. That is one of the most urgent needs at this time. Let us build up a national income so that the devastating effects of high taxation can be overcome. This, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is one solution of our problem of high taxation.

Mr. F. W. TOWNLEY-SMITH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed once more to draw attention to the fact that it is only with extreme difficulty that a great number of members of this house are able to hear what is going on. Architecturally and artistically this is a beautiful building, but I fear that acoustically we are not so fortunate. In spite of all that has been said to the contrary, I repeat that a great many members are not able to hear one-half of what is being said and a still greater number are unable to hear with ease what is said. Very few of us are able to sit back and relax and listen with pleasure, and I do not mean that in the way that some hon. members are taking it. I again ask that something be done about the matter.

On motion of Mr. Townley-Smith the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie the house adjourned at 5.55 p.m.