

packing houses. They took advantage of a shortage, perhaps created by themselves. It is a dangerous position for this government to take, to allow people who are more interested in making money than in prosecuting the war to hold up the taxpayers of Canada through the Minister of Munitions and Supply in order to get higher prices for a commodity that is short, when the shortage has perhaps been created by themselves. That is something that should be definitely prohibited. If this government places a price ceiling on any commodity, it should prevail. Munitions and Supply have a priority; every war material has a priority, and these rules and regulations should not be tossed aside at a moment's notice. This is a weakness which should be corrected.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. gentleman says that I said that these higher prices enabled the packers to profiteer at the expense of the government. Those are not my words at all. I do not know who got the benefit of that; it may have been the farmers who delivered the cattle.

Mr. GILLIS: I think that was the effect.

Mr. ILSLEY: There was a time when cattle were hardly being delivered at all.

Mr. PERLEY: We have heard a great deal to-night about salaries, and I should like to say something in favour of the local committees that have been set up. These committees have been set up in the rural parts of Saskatchewan and, if I understood the minister aright, he said that in some cases they are paid by the municipality in which they operate. I have received some complaints that this remuneration was not sufficient to reimburse these people for their time. Other people have given their time voluntarily, and it is of those people that I want to say a word of praise. The committees were set up to assist in the operation of the price ceiling. I am not complaining about the salaries paid to inspectors or investigators, but I should like to know how many inspectors there are to cover the rural parts of Saskatchewan. Did I understand the minister to say that in some cases the rural municipality or town is paying for the services rendered by these local committees?

Mr. ILSLEY: Not the members of the committee, but for certain of the expenses. Some municipalities, I do not know whether they are rural, pay some of the expenses of the local ration boards, and in other cases they are assisted to varied extents by the board. This does not apply to the members

of the ration board who work on a voluntary basis, it applies to secretaries, clerks and so on. This vote of \$600,000 would be just over \$1,000 per board because there are 550 boards.

Mr. PERLEY: There is no voluntary work at all?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, by the members of the boards, but not by the stenographers or secretaries.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): The chairman is usually the reeve or the mayor.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. PERLEY: Is that quite general in the west?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, that is general.

I did not reply to the hon. member for New Westminster. If I do not cover all the points which he made, he will remind me. He has brought to the attention of the committee two prosecutions under circumstances which evoke sympathy. I have not any knowledge of these prosecutions, but I will bear in mind what he has said and bring his observations to the attention of the head enforcement officer of the board.

With regard to the rental control, he suggested that control was imposed in British Columbia in January, 1940. The first order freezing rents was of October 1, 1940; it is dated September 24, 1940, but it provides that it shall become effective on and after October 1, 1940. That order applied to the following municipalities:

Nova Scotia: Dartmouth and Woodside; Halifax, Armdale, Buckingham Station, Dutch Settlement, Fairview Station, Falkland, Jolli-more and Melville; New Glasgow, Trenton, Stellarton and Westville; Sydney.

Quebec: Brownsburg and Thetford Mines.

Ontario: Allandale, Barrie; Kingston and Portsmouth; Ottawa, Eastview, New Edinburgh, Overbrook, Rockliffe, Westboro and Woodroffe; Parry Sound and Nobel; Trenton, Windsor.

Manitoba: Brandon.

British Columbia: Vancouver, Victoria and Esquimalt.

It froze the rents as of January 2, 1940. It is possible—and perhaps this is the argument of my hon. friend—that rents rose in these other places before they rose in Vancouver, Victoria and Esquimalt. I would not know about that. I do not know whether that is the situation, but I do know that the complaint about the freezing of rents is general; it is not local at all; there are just as many from Nova Scotia and, certainly, from Ontario as from any other part of Canada. The argument is not local or territorial; it is individual. It is that certain landlords were slower than others or more merciful than others or something of that kind