

If we must indulge in this pastime, why do we always get our estimates too high? If there is any merit in sending out information to an anxiously awaiting wheat market, why do we always send it out in a manner calculated to break the market down to lower prices? Why not, every once in a while, give the farmer a break and lead the markets to believe they may be short of wheat, and the people short of bread?

I believe the principle to be unsound. A parallel case would be for the Department of Trade and Commerce to tell the importing countries that Canadian pulp and paper mills will this year produce \$500 million worth of pulp and paper, and then about June cut the estimate down to \$400 million, and finally cut it again to \$350 million, which would be within \$50 million of what it was in 1944. What a howl would go up! Yet the case is not quite parallel, because nobody ever knows how much grain is produced in any given year. We know, of course, how much is delivered to the elevators, but no one knows how much is used for feed on the farms, how much is spoiled and lost, or how much is held back in storage in the farm granaries. There is no system for finding that out, so that even final estimates are at best just guesses which may or may not be reasonably close. The pulp and paper mills would know exactly what their production was, but whether or not they would want the information broadcast half way through the production year is something else again.

No; the principle and practice of issuing inaccurate information is vicious and wrong, and when it concerns foodstuffs or wearing material it is more particularly so. It is just as wrong as the practice of gambling in these commodities on the grain exchange or the cotton exchange, and is often regarded as being part of the system. It is high time we cut ourselves away from this iniquitous system of trading upon the wants and needs of the common people and regarded these gambling operations as the relics of a careless and selfish civilization. This must be what Mr. LaGuardia had in mind in his statement before the food and agricultural organization at Copenhagen, which he repeated before the united nations organization at Lake Success last November, where it was greeted with prolonged applause. This is what he said:

You cannot have both stability in prices and security for the farmer, as well as fluctuation in prices. It is no use saying that we are not going to interfere with free exchange and free sales. If you want what is needed, you will interfere and you will put every gambling grain exchange out of business in Chicago, Winnipeg, or Liverpool, or wherever it exists.

[Mr. Townley-Smith.]

As is generally known, Mr. LaGuardia was secretary general of UNRRA, and his knowledge and experience in the feeding and clothing of the poor and destitute peoples of the world cannot be denied. His statement, therefore, must be listened to with the greatest consideration and concern. It is indeed fortunate that we in this country have taken steps to check the gambling in grains. Let us hurry the process along and bring into being a system of orderly marketing which will be acclaimed by ordinary peoples all over the world. Let us be fair and compassionate, and put humanity first.

Mr. G. S. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to refer to a statement made yesterday by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Mackenzie) at page 1041 of *Hansard*, where in replying to certain remarks that had been made by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross), he said:

Last evening my hon. friend referred to a cost plus contract, to which I shall refer in a moment. These, however, were not cost plus contracts; they were management fee contracts, and the average price or fee or reward to the contractor was in the neighbourhood of \$200 per house.

A few moments ago the hon. member for Souris rose on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, but he was not allowed to make his statement. I would therefore refer the minister to the proceedings of the special committee on veterans affairs of June 3, 1946, where at page 773 the hon. member for Souris asked the following question of Mr. Murchison, director, Soldier Settlement and Veterans' Land Act:

Are all the veterans' homes under the Veterans' Land Act constructed on a cost plus basis?

Mr. Murchison's answer was:

No; I mentioned in the statement which I made this morning that a number of these houses were let on a firm price basis, one at Calgary, one at Lethbridge, and one at Moncton, and also a few in Ontario about 200, which were let on a firm price basis. The rest were all cost plus basis.

Then I would refer the minister to appendix "B" to the proceedings of the veterans affairs committee of June 24, 1946, where at page 1082 a table is given headed "Veterans' Land Act—Cost plus fixed fee contracts" which shows that 2,551 housing units were constructed in seven provinces; one of the units specially mentioned is the Winnipeg, Manitoba, project, where 245 houses were constructed, and comprised in that are 90 units which are known as Charleswood units, of which the hon. member for Souris was speaking. Having regard to this information contained in the proceedings of the veterans