

affairs committee, perhaps the minister would make a further statement particularly in view of the statement made yesterday that these contracts were not on a cost plus basis.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think perhaps there is a little confusion over the term used. As I stated, and this is the actual fact, there was a management fee paid in certain cases, and it amounted to \$210. In one case it is cost plus and in the other it is cost plus a fixed fee. That is the only difference. The fixed fee was \$210.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): So that there will be no misunderstanding, when the minister refers to \$210 as the management fee, does he call that a cost plus contract?

Mr. MACKENZIE: No, I would not; some might.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Am I correct then in stating that the proceedings of the veterans committee which I quoted, and I refer particularly to the evidence of Mr. Murchison, the director of the Veterans' Land Act, is wrong? In answer to a question put by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) Mr. Murchison said that apart from the few units which he mentioned the rest were on a cost plus basis.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is not necessarily wrong at all. I say I have given the correct analysis of the situation. It is a management fee, plus cost basis; actual cost, plus a fee of \$210 a house. Nothing can be more explicit than that.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): The minister may say that nothing can be more explicit than that, but when you speak of a cost plus contract the ordinary person understands that to mean exactly what it says.

Mr. TUCKER: What does the hon. member find fault with?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): May I ask the minister one further question? Yesterday he informed the house that repairs would be made to these veterans' houses at an expenditure of some \$500,000 to \$700,000. Until such time as these repairs are completed, what will be done about the contracts now pending, and what will be done about eviction orders now pending?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I think it is unfair to ask such a question at this time. All I can say is that the administration will deal with the whole situation with sympathy, with understanding and I hope with some expert knowledge.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I do not think it is a bit unfair at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I should like to remind hon. members that we are not in committee. Hon. members should make their speeches and not question other hon. members.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): The minister of his own accord introduced this matter into the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Just a moment, please. He said that he was being very frank. He explained that the taxpayers were to be called on to pay \$500,000 to \$700,000 to repair these houses. I am not quarreling with that, but I am bringing to his attention now the fact that in a great many instances there are contracts pending for the purchase of these houses. Where repairs are to be made it is only fair to know what is to be done in regard to these repairs before the contract is signed. The same thing applies to any veterans who may be faced with an eviction order. There are to be repairs to be made on these houses. What is to be done in regard to the eviction orders? I am not trying to embarrass the minister.

Mr. TUCKER: What does the hon. member mean by "eviction order"? Explain that.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): The hon. member is a lawyer, and surely I do not have to explain to him what is an eviction order.

Mr. TUCKER: When a man buys a house under the Veterans Land Act he cannot receive an eviction order. I wish the hon. member would explain what he means.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Some veterans have received orders to get out by May 1.

Mr. TUCKER: That is not an eviction order. The hon. member is talking about a legal eviction order. That is not one at all.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is a dispossession.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I should like to remind the minister and his parliamentary assistant that it is most difficult, indeed almost impossible, to do certain repairs on a house and have anything like a first class job after they are completed.

I should like to refer to the announcement made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) a few days ago in regard to the rental regulations. He dealt with relief to be given certain people who had bought houses between November 1, 1944 and July 25, 1945. This relief will be of little effect, because like all these controls there are certain strings attached