

this kind of thing, has finally given up the attempt. As I indicated at the outset, I am not opposed to extension of the Act. But I am opposed to any attempt at keeping an equilibrium between the contending classes that I have mentioned. In any such attempt the persons likely to suffer most are those who in their kindness of heart are seeking to do what they believe to be best, but which experience shows is impossible. I was talking today to a young man from Vancouver. There was a municipal election out there, and a non-partisan candidate, with lots of experience in council, polled 24,000 votes as against more than 19,000 for a semi-communist. What was the issue? Opposition to increased street-car fares—although the proposed increase would not have been enough to take care of the extra wages granted to the railway men. That kind of philosophy is rampant. The attitude that “a law that will protect me at your expense is a good law” is gaining ground all over this country. We as a people, and especially those of us who are in parliament, have got to think this problem clear through and not be carried away by arguments on one side or the other.

It is sometimes said that in the Senate there are directors of a large number of banks, trust companies and corporations of one kind and another. But who owns our corporations? Who owns the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance? Its shareholders are scattered all over Canada, the United States and other countries. Who owns our great banks? Hundreds of people own small numbers of shares—two, ten, twenty shares. A corporation is managed by a board of directors, men chosen because they are considered to be capable of giving good management, and their tenure of office largely depends on their efficiency.

I did not intend to speak so long. My purpose is to impress upon honourable members the issue involved in these controls. Between now and March 31 the leader of this house will participate in cabinet meetings at which the question of what controls shall be continued and what ones shall be dropped is under consideration. I believe that if we had not had controls at all we would find it much easier to get out of our present troubles. Honourable members of this house may disagree with me, but in spite of all the arguments uphill and down dale, that is my belief. The President of the United States said recently that the putting back of controls in his country would amount to police control. That is the effect of the regulations in Canada.

There are certain people in my own city who, because of the system of rent control,

are snooping around to see if somebody is charging fifty cents a month more for rent than he should. There are instances of men who worked on the railway, and who by thrift acquired homes of their own and also bought the property alongside: they lived in one house and rented the other. Today if the manager, or the widow, looking after the rented property is charging a couple of dollars more a month than is allowed, action is taken; and if the regulations are being broken a penalty of \$25 and costs is imposed. That policy of police administration makes sneaks out of next-door neighbours, who when someone is charging a higher rent than is allowed, run and tell the authorities. That is the effect of controls. There are families with four or five children in my city living on incomes of \$150, or perhaps \$175, per month. How they get along with the present high cost of living is beyond my comprehension. Men and women in social services tell me that there is more hardship and poverty among this class of people in our city today than there was in the depression days.

I admit that the government is faced with problems, and I am not going to criticize it for what has been done about controls in the past six months. While I do disapprove of what the Minister of Finance has done in some matters, I believe he is making a real effort to overcome great difficulties. For instance, I criticize him for the regulations affecting oats and barley. I suggest that action should have been taken at the first of August; and he should be the first to admit it. But, I repeat, he is making a real effort to get out from under controls.

I do not believe the government can suddenly do away with rent controls. In my opinion the better course would be to say that in six months, a year, or at some definite date in the future, the controls on rent would come off. If the government said that, and stuck to it, the people would be prepared for the lifting of controls. The date for removal should be around the first of July, which is the best time of the year to make the change.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: What does my honourable friend think of provincial rights?

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Provincial rights are being interfered with, but the provincial governments are conniving at these matters.

Honourable members may point to many cases in which rent control is helpful. But I contend that the help is only going to individuals, and affects only the persons involved in particular cases. The difficulty is that when a house becomes vacant it is immediately put