

—of course, I am now thinking particularly of the members of another place—they are pretty good fellows. They would not get elected unless they were.

One control that I want to say a word or two about is the rentals control. In 1941 when the Government established the rentals control throughout this country a good many people thought; as I do still, that it would mean putting one or two thousand dollars in the pocket of everyone who owned a house. And that is just what happened, for since then there has been virtually no building of houses for rent. In the West, and I presume in every other part of the country, no houses have been built except by private individuals for their own use. Everybody who understood the housing situation said: "The minute you put control on the rent of houses, people will stop building them for rent, and owners who are now renting will sell, so the very people you try to protect will be evicted." That is exactly what happened. Just lately an order was issued prohibiting the owner from evicting a tenant. That is putting one control on top of another.

Now, the Government is building houses in Winnipeg and, I believe, in other cities, and as a result private builders are unable to get supplies. For instance, in Winnipeg seven hundred houses under construction by private individuals are standing uncompleted through lack of supplies, because these supplies are needed for the two hundred houses to be erected by the Government. I do not think the Government can make a success of housing. I expect to be still a member of the Senate when these Government-constructed houses in Winnipeg are condemned and classified as slum buildings. And the Government is putting up houses not only in the city itself but some seven miles north. An acre of land goes with each of these houses, which presumably are to be occupied by people who work in town. How can a man live that far from his work unless he has his own car? Houses are also being built by the Government west and south of Winnipeg. The money spent on these places and the materials used in them will be wasted. It would have been far better if the Government had encouraged people to build in the city.

In establishing a control why did the Government pick on the one form of wealth that the ordinary person uses more widely than any other? If I have bonds the Government does not prevent me from collecting my interest; but see how I am treated if I own a house that is rented. Suppose I had bought a house in 1930. For the first six

years I may have got a rent of \$11 a month. The taxes were \$25 a month, but for rent I had to take either \$11 or nothing. For the next five years, up to 1941, I was able to get, say, \$30 a month. Then when the time came that I could have got \$75 the rentals board said: "Oh, no. You were getting \$30 a month in 1941 and you are stuck at that." That policy is wrong, honourable senators. It leads to just what has happened. All the restrictions that have been imposed have not resulted in the building of a single house in Manitoba, but they have stopped the building of many.

It is said that the returned man deserves proper housing. Of course he does; but it is my experience that the man who chooses his own house is likely to be much better satisfied with it than he would be with one twice as good that was chosen for him by the Government, even though the cost of the better house was no higher. One of the problems of firms who build houses is to anticipate the desire of purchasers. Let me give an illustration. In 1927 a contracting firm in Winnipeg bought a hundred lots as house sites. The firm's programme for that year ran into about \$500,000. A woman would be taken to see a house—after all, it is usually the wife who exercises the choice in such a matter. She would say: "I do not like the view from here. If the house was on that lot over there, it would suit me fine." Well, the contractor would then arrange to duplicate the house on the desired lot, and take his chance of selling the existing house to someone else.

Another problem that this country faces is the providing of jobs. I agree with an editorial on this subject that appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* a few days ago. During the war men were earning six or seven dollars a day or more doing a job in a factory, in good healthful surroundings. The job was worth that at the time. As a friend of mine said the other day, when his company was making an airplane at a cost of approximately half a million dollars it did not matter much if the cost was increased by \$50,000. If the airplane was in the right place at the right time it was worth a million. But once the war ended that was no longer true. We are now producing for peacetime consumption, and our commodities have to be sold on world markets. In order to be able to sell we must produce more cheaply than our competitors. If I have a factory in which every man makes one hundred articles a day, and a competitor's employees turn out a daily average of two hundred articles of the same kind, that competitor can undersell me. He can market his goods