

board. As he knows, one of the great menaces to the success of any rationing scheme is a widely scattered source of supply, and perhaps one of the reasons why it is easier to ration in Britain than in Canada is because in Britain it is easier to control the source of supply. For that reason, generally speaking, our rationing authorities have felt that they must see that the slaughtering was done by large slaughterers—I do not mean very large slaughterers but those who are doing a considerable amount of slaughtering. They are not able to carry that out in deficiency areas. To date they feel that they are pledged to carry out the rule in areas which cannot be called deficiency areas. At least that is my latest information. I would call situations like this to the attention of those members of the house who think the problems of rationing are not difficult in a country like Canada. There are some hon. members who think it would be very easy to put everything under control and make an equitable distribution by rationing, but as a matter of fact nothing is more difficult and vexatious to work out than a rationing system which will work without imposing on the population intolerable burdens of inconvenience and so forth.

All I can say to my hon. friend is that I will bring this matter once more to the attention of my officials and it will be given further consideration. I do not know myself what it may prove practicable to do.

Mr. DUPUIS: There is one feature I should bring to the minister's attention, namely, that on the Montreal market there are two types of people selling goods. First, there are the bona fide farmers who are allowed to sell there freely. Then, there are the pedlars or dealers who go around the county and buy up hogs of different types and grades and, in the guise of farmers, try to sell those hogs on the market. These are the people who were the first to ask to be granted a licence under the wartime prices and trade board. But they are not farmers. I am told by a number of hon. members that many of these traders make a black market, so that the result will be much worse than it is to-day; farmers will suffer injustice, and our war effort will be correspondingly hindered. I want the minister to know that, and I know it personally. I should very much like to see the wartime prices and trade board rectify this injustice, annul a policy which makes for black markets, and grant this concession to the ordinary farmer who sells one or two hogs on the local market.

Mr. QUELCH: I wish to discuss as briefly as possible the proposals which were put forward by certain officials in Great Britain, the United States and Canada regarding an international stabilization of currency and an international exchange union.

The Canadian officials in their pamphlet outline their objective in the following words:

The establishment of an international monetary mechanism which will aid in the restoration and development of healthy international trade after the war, which will achieve a high degree of exchange stability, and which will not conflict with the desire of countries to carry out such policies as they may think appropriate to achieve, so far as possible, economic stability at a high level of employment and incomes.

The British proposals also outline their objective, in subsection (g) of section 1, in a very similar way.

I have read these proposals through carefully, and I have come to the conclusion that the officials of all three countries were apparently more interested in trying to find a profitable market for the gold of the world, more interested in trying to devise ways and means whereby the gold production of their countries might be utilized to dominate world trade, than they were to reach their declared objective, namely, to find ways and means of bringing about the freest possible exchange of goods as between nations.

I have looked through a number of periodicals, including the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Christian Science Monitor* and *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, and I find that the majority of their writers seem to take the same view. I will quote what John H. Williams has to say in the last number of *Foreign Affairs*:

Not only are the two plans fundamentally similar in their mechanical aspects—

He is here referring to the British and United States plans.

—but the monetary mechanism provided in both is essentially a gold standard mechanism.

Then, referring to the Keynes plan, he says:

One can read fairly readily between the lines that these provisions are due not to any great concern about gold on Keynes part but most likely to his recognition of the political requirements of getting his plan accepted. With the British empire the principal gold producer, and the U.S.A. the principal holder it is not likely that any plan which does not provide a market for a monetary use for gold will be acceptable in either country.

If that is true, I think we must admit that a very selfish motive is behind that proposal. It is specifically what might be called a rich nations' proposal, and for that reason personally I am not in favour of it, because I do not think it will achieve the objective laid down