

Mr. STANSELL: If that is correct, if it would not increase the price by one cent to the consumer, we have one of the greatest objections taken away. We would accomplish two very great things by the operation of the Board if that is true. If there would be a gain of \$25,000,000 to the producers where would it come from?

Mr. ROBINSON: I have tried to answer that question two or three times, and I do not think that I should repeat it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out that it is six o'clock when we automatically adjourn and I would like to know when the Committee wishes to meet again and whom they wish to hear;

Mr. SALES: I move that we meet to-morrow at eleven o'clock to hear Mr. Robinson further and then Mr. Maharg.

Mr. MILLAR: Connected with the statement in regard to the price to the consumer, I have a very brief statement which I would like to make;

The CHAIRMAN: If you would allow us to decide the question of the next meeting and whom you wish to hear, the Committee, I think, would give you a minute or two to make your statement.

Mr. GARLAND: Did not the report of the sub-committee set out the procedure which we were to follow? We were to hear the two representatives of the Council of Agriculture and then representatives from other bodies. The milling interests and the grain exchange were mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: The milling interests were next.

Mr. MCKAY: Are we to have no representatives of the retailers?

The CHAIRMAN: The question to decide now is whether we shall meet to-morrow and whom we shall hear. The sub-committee will decide any other questions. Is it the desire of the Committee to sit to-morrow and hear Mr. Maharg?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Will Mr. Maharg be here to-morrow?

Mr. MAHARG: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. MILLAR: I am anxious that this statement should go down because it bears directly on the question of increase or otherwise in the price. This occurred a year ago last winter. A man took a car of wheat to the mill, and taking into consideration the price of his flour which he received, the shorts which he received, the bran which he received and the price of wheat at that time, and even after taking out his toll he made one dollar per bushel on thirty bushels, a trifle over one dollar a bushel. From that I think you will see that at a time when there was no Wheat Board controlling there was an enormous profit between the price of the wheat and the price of the flour.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am sure we all appreciate the very fair manner in which Mr. Robinson has discussed the matter. He has enabled us to look at it from a different standpoint. But I would just like to ask him this question: We all realize that the re-establishment of the Wheat Board might have a very disturbing effect on the business of the country. If the Wheat Board is a good thing, would it not be better to advocate a permanent Board? I think Mr. Robinson made a statement that the chief objection to making it permanent was a possibility of the Board running wild and the farmers might desire to get away from it. We have not a Wheat Board carrying on now, and to re-establish the Board might be a very disturbing factor to those who are engaged in the business. Would it not remove a strong objection if those who are back of it would advocate permanency rather than a temporary Board?

[Mr. James Robinson.]