

As far as the feed mills are concerned, we have had a period of two years when the two test cases were going forward through the courts, and they have ultimately been decided in our favour. So we have only recently commenced enforcement against them.

There are some problems of enforcement against feed mills which are somewhat different from enforcement against elevators. At the present time we have sufficient power to enforce them, and we are proceeding on the basis that this is so, and we believe it is.

Once we have been working for a year or so we will know if there are any loopholes in our regulations or in our act. But at the present time we do not know of any. I think that is a fair statement. Experience will show us. I may say we are meeting some resistance. Probably it is quite natural, under the circumstances.

Mr. JORGENSON: A resistance from whom—the producers themselves?

Mr. MONK: We requested information as to quotas, and we have not yet got it. We have requested information from feed mills as to who has delivered to them, the amounts of grain that were delivered, and when it was delivered, and some of the mills have refused to give it to us. We are in process of considering that matter.

Mr. CADIEU: I have a question which I wish to follow up, on the other question I had and on which I was interrupted. A firm brought this question to my attention. It is a bonded firm, paying \$3,000 a year for the bond, and I think they have got a logical complaint when they were charged, as I pointed out, 9½ cents over what the wheat board paid. And yet they see many people in their district—retail businessmen—selling all kinds of other things and paying much below the price. And this is going back to other users of feed who have been selling washing machines and television sets.

This is a bonded firm, and they are running a good business. They are very much hurt about this. I can understand their position. While I certainly do not want to do anything to destroy the wheat board, I really do believe they have a logical “beef”.

Mr. McNAMARA: I can appreciate the problem of a legitimate firm that is buying these feed supplies from the board at our regular asking price and, at the same time, seeing others who are not so engaged—I am not suggesting feed mills, but implement dealers, television people—securing supplies of grain from farmers at distress prices well below the market value. But that is outside our control, because if that sale is within the province and the grain that is purchased from the farmer is not delivered into commercial facilities, but is fed, it is legal under our act and we cannot do anything about that.

Mr. MONK: It is outside the scope of our act. It is within the provincial jurisdiction. That is exactly the type of thing that I meant could be met by enforcement of the provincial statute in that respect.

Mr. KORCHINSKI: The wheat board is apparently interested in tightening the regulations affecting the quotas, and in this case the feed mills will be affected so as to register any sales to the feed mills in every permit book.

Would that still not leave—as was mentioned here earlier—implement dealers and a few other avenues whereby you still will not have control over the quota in each area? You will still have a loophole there. Even though there is a provincial regulation, the fact is that there still remains a loophole in there; is that right?

Mr. MONK: The scheme of control is based upon the constitutional problem that exists in Canada; namely, that the dominion government cannot pass laws controlling sales wholly within a province that do not use railways or commercial facilities. As far as sales to implement dealers and the like are