

they believed there would be a considerable shortage the following season. But an exceptionally hard winter intervened, and some ranchers lost two or three hundred head. I know of a woman, who lived not far from a ranch in which I am interested, who committed suicide because she could not bear to stand by and see the cattle die. As you go through that country, you see truckloads of the bones of these animals piled up on the prairie and in the barnyards. Today we are deprived of these cattle as the result of a policy which was adopted for purely political reasons. The West has not the voting strength of the East. Eastern Canada is allowed to ship cattle, which are not even good dairy cattle, to the extent of hundreds of thousands a year.

I want to point to another injustice in the control of the cost of living. I invite anyone who is interested to go to the market and see what happens to a carload of cattle. The top price is paid for perhaps three or four animals, and for the rest the price is away down. A lot of splendid beef has been sold on the market at 20 cents a pound. Any average beef animal will dress 50 per cent; the better stock will run as high as 58 per cent; sometimes really good animals go up to 60 per cent. These figures refer to an animal that is trimmed; its legs are off at the knee; the head also is off, although the choicest meat is on the cheeks; and the tongue, heart and liver sell for a high price. My contention is that the cost to the consumer is out of proportion to the price paid to the producer; some parties "in between" are making more than they ever did.

Much the same thing happened when the government set itself to reduce the price of eggs. As a result, thousands of people went out of the chicken business. Now we are facing a shortage of chickens and eggs. Yet consider what the average labouring man has to pay when he goes to a restaurant for a meal. One of the honourable senators from Nova Scotia was with me recently at the Toronto Exhibition, and we had a meal at a restaurant run by Canada Catering Company. Roast beef was two dollars and a half a plate; yet if that grade of beef was sold at \$5 a pound the caterers could make a profit from the size of serving they gave. The same statement applies to bacon.

I have another job for the Minister of Agriculture. Recently he persuaded a large line of restaurants to stock apple juice. I suggest that it would be a good idea to have a law to provide that any restaurant which serves pullet eggs should be required to put up an announcement "Pullet eggs are served

here". They are only half the weight of Grade A eggs, and are 15 cents a dozen cheaper.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Why not sell them by weight?

Hon. Mr. Horner: Yes. That would be a fair way of doing it. I asked that my eggs be served in their shells, so that they would not get lost in the egg-cup. I was charged 50 cents for two eggs and some toast. At the present price of eggs there is no justification for that sort of thing.

Any further interference, or even talk of interference, on these lines will only result in a further lowering of production. A farmer must have a certain level of prices. And while talking of the position of the farmers, I propose to speak briefly on the subject of wheat. I know something about it. I am not at all astonished that farmers throughout western Canada are shocked at the present condition of affairs. I have farmed long enough in the west to know that when a small quantity of wheat is damaged by frost it can be graded higher because it can be mixed with better grades. Elevators, in their anxiety to get rid of the lower grade wheat, are deliberately grading it down to perhaps No. 4 or No. 5, although I have seen samples graded No. 3 that are no better than other wheat which is graded No. 5. This is a serious matter for the farmer.

In this connection let me say that I am, and have been for years, awfully tired of the smart alecks who go around the country estimating the crop and talking about the probable carry-over. Why they should busy themselves with other people's affairs is more than I can understand. In other lines of business people are permitted to keep secret the supplies they have on hand: then why should the farmers' production be publicized all over the world? Today we find ourselves with a crop whose value is reduced by about \$200 million. In the national interest it would be a good thing to aim at a carry-over of 200 million bushels. Who will get the benefit this year of the extra dollar a bushel which our wheat is worth when the better quantities are mixed with grades 4 and 5 and the whole is raised to a milling grade? Will the companies reap the benefit or will it go to the producer of the grain? If our carry-over equalled 200 million bushels, most of our wheat could be brought up to milling standards. I notice an item in a Saskatoon paper stating that some farmers are dumping their wheat on the ground in preference to selling it at present prices. My advice to the farmers is, by all means to keep their wheat.