

price at which they are being sold to-day. Since the House rose at six o'clock I have been looking at the Montreal Gazette, and I find that bran is quoted at \$54.25 a ton and shorts at \$61.25. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford complains that there is \$10 of a difference in the selling price between bran and shorts, but this quotation from Montreal shows a difference of only \$7, and the same obtains in Winnipeg. The price of bran in carload lots in Winnipeg is \$48 and shorts \$55 per carload.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the hon. member deny that the wheat board fixed a difference of \$10 between the two?

Mr. WILSON (Saskatoon): Not to my knowledge. Now, in Australia the Government Control Board sells wheat at slightly less to the millers than they can get in the export market in order to give the mills a little advantage in being able to mill at home and so have feed at home. It is very important, I think, that as much as possible of the wheat should be milled in the country, from the point of view not only of employment, but also of feed. You cannot have an abundance of feed if the mills are not running pretty well up to capacity, and it would seem to me that unless there can be some closing up on the ocean rates at present existing between flour and wheat at 25 cents a hundred it will almost put the mills out of business in this country. If such a policy is allowed to be carried out by any shipping company it can easily extinguish an industry in this country so far as exports are concerned, and I think the Government should use their good offices in bringing to the attention of the shipping companies this unfair discrimination; for after all, there is not much difference in the handling charges between transferring a car of flour and a car of wheat from a car to a vessel. I think, therefore, that there is an unfair discrimination to the injury of the milling business and the country. If we pursue a policy of milling wheat in this country only to the extent of our home consumption of flour, our farm lands will be ruined to such an extent that they will be impoverished. The only way in which you can retain the fertility of the land is to return as much as possible back to it of the product which you take from it. You can turn it back in the way of bran and shorts through the medium of feeding stock and obtaining the resultant fertilizer. I hope that the members of the committee

will see the necessity of this amendment as introduced by the minister. The mills are not asking for anything unfair. There was a similar regulation in the United States when they had wheat control. The Wheat Control Board could give a preference so long as it did not operate to the detriment of the people. They had power to give a preference to the export of flour.

Mr. MAHARG: Will the minister say what he considers would be a proper interpretation of the word "preference" in his amendment? To what extent will it apply?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not able to answer that question, and I do not think that the hon. member quite expects me to answer it. You have a board that represents all the different interests concerned, a board of practical men of wide knowledge. They fix these prices, and I think we can trust them to give what they consider to be a fair and equitable consideration to the two products during the process of their sale. I do not think you could apply any academic rule of preference. It would depend to a large extent on the sales and on the parties to whom you sold. But the main principle is established for their guidance, that they should see to it that a preference be given unless there is a prejudicial effect upon the public interests. For instance, if you were too hard in pushing your preference on flour you might to that national customer lose the sale of your wheat as well. All these considerations enter into the question. In connection with what my hon. friend has said in regard to the discrimination in ocean rates, in so far as that can be remedied without taking the matter up particularly with the different steamship carrying interests, the wheat board has an opportunity of overcoming that differentiation which is the rule of the carrying steamships. For example, in negotiations with, let us say, the Greek Government there would be the condition that whilst the Greeks paid so much for their wheat and the wheat board agreed to deliver the grain as the seaboard the Greek government would undertake to provide its own carrying capacity and send its own vessels, chartered or otherwise; and in these cases, of course, the discrimination or differentiation between wheat and flour does not come in.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not like to delay the House but it appears to me the only way in which we can get information in regard to the operations of this board, not having a report from them it to get it in-