

by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes), in these words:

I understood from his (Mr. Robb's) remarks that in connection with the order for sale of wheat in England to which he refers there was a loss having regard to the price which subsequently had to be paid in Canada for that grain. Who bore that loss and how was it made up?

The House will see that the hon. member for Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) got the same impression that I did and it was the only impression that could be taken from the words of my hon. friend—that the wheat had been sold, that therefore a loss had occurred, and that the Grain Exchange was shut down in order that the Government might escape some part of that loss. My hon. friend (Mr. Robb) said further:

Mr. Robb: I did not say there was a loss. I quoted a statement made publicly in the Winnipeg Grain Exchange that Mr. Lloyd Harris had said that the right hon. Prime Minister had cabled the Rt. Hon. Arthur Sifton to sell fifty or seventy-five million bushels of Canadian wheat, and the impression left upon the members of the Grain Exchange was that because Mr. Lloyd Harris or Rt. Hon. Arthur Sifton or whoever was acting for them had carried out these instructions and had sold this wheat it became necessary to close the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and fix the price of wheat so that the wheat could be secured and delivered without too great a loss to Canada. I am waiting for some person to clear that up.

Now, there was the reiterated statement that the wheat was sold, that there was a loss, and that therefore this inference of my hon. friend from Haliburton was perfectly correct. I then rose and said:

There is not a shadow of foundation for a statement of that kind or any such inference from a statement of that kind as my hon. friend has made on several occasions in this House, leading to the impression that the Government sold short in Great Britain and then, to cover themselves, stopped the Exchange operations when wheat went up. If any one says that he makes a base unfounded assertion which has not one iota of truth in it.

Mr. Robb: The statement is made that Hon. Arthur Sifton did sell the wheat and no one denies that to-day.

Sir George Foster: The statement is not made that Mr. Sifton sold 75,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. Robb: The minister to-day denies that statement that the wheat was sold.

There again is the reiteration that it was his belief that the wheat was actually sold. Then this interjection was made:

Mr. Meighen: Nobody made the statement except yourself.

Mr. Robb: Do not be so sure about that.

If the hon. member for Chateauguay can bring any person, or any authority, to say that that wheat was sold then he will have

done something which he has not done up to this time. I thought it was only fair that Dr. Magill, who—according to the hon. member for Chateauguay—lies under the imputation of having told the Winnipeg Grain Exchange that Mr. Sifton had sold 50,000,000 or 75,000,000 bushels of wheat in Great Britain,—should be cleared of that imputation. He did not say so, nor do I know any one in Canada, or out of it, who has said so with the simple exception of the hon. member for Chateauguay.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 3—Wheat Board may be constituted:

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I should like some information as to the names and the occupations of the members of the present board?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The following are the names of the members of the present board: James Stewart, H. W. Wood, Frederick William Riddell, W. A. Black, Norman McLeod Patterson; Wm. L. Best; C. B. Watts; Wm. H. McWilliams, Joe. Quintal, Lieut.-Col. J. Z. Fraser, Wm. A. Matheson, F. O. Fowler.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: According to reports published in the press in September last some comment has been indulged in with regard to the criticisms of the Wheat Board offered by the old Board of Commerce when the insinuation, if not the direct charge, was made that the large milling companies were represented on this board to a greater degree than was advisable in the public interests. In fact the statement was made that two members of the large milling companies and the secretary of the Dominion Milling Company were members of this board, and that the interests of the producer and the consumer were not represented to the extent that they should be.

Has the attention of the Government been directed to the fact that the discrimination was against the producing of food owing to the fixation of prices by the board on the by-products of wheat? They differentiated to the extent of \$10 per ton between bran and shorts, although, as is well known, there is a difference of only one per cent in the protein contents of those two commodities, and the lack of protein in the bran was made up by the admixture of screenings. I think in view of the complications which have arisen in respect to the Board of Commerce, we ought to find out whether it is the intention of the Govern-