

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: They are getting paid for the use of those facilities.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: They are getting paid for the use of those facilities. That is what they are there for. Under the law, what has capital done, starting back as many years as you like, when no facilities existed? According to my interpretation of the law, it is the right of the privately-owned country elevator to send grain stored in it to its own privately-owned terminal elevator. Under that condition, what has capital done? It has invested \$85,000,000. With that investment it has provided somewhere in the neighbourhood of 3,400 country elevators and something like 52,000,000 bushels of storage capacity at the head of the Lakes. Now, what does my honourable friend propose?

It has been stated to our Committee, without there being any question as to the exactness of the statement, that country elevators operating alone cannot operate successfully. I say again that it has been demonstrated to us that terminal elevators operating alone cannot operate successfully. Am I not right? Was not that the effect of the evidence submitted to us? My honourable friend shakes his head.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: I do not think that was demonstrated by the evidence.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: What is the evidence with regard to the Grand Trunk elevators and the C.P.R. elevators?

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: Those are terminals.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: What is the evidence with regard to the Spiller people? They had their terminal at Vancouver, and they had to acquire country elevators.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: I thought you were speaking of the country elevators.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: We have not any evidence with regard to the elevator system in Manitoba; but as a matter of fact, as my honourable friend knows, and as I know, the elevator system without terminals failed because it had no terminals. We also know that the C.P.R., because they had no feeders, had to hand over their terminals after they built them to people who had feeders. There is no question about the evidence in that regard.

However, Mr. Chairman, I only wished to place a few facts before this Committee with reference to the number of elevators that we are dealing with. I simply wish to make this one point clear: I am as much in favour of

co-operation amongst our farmers as any member of this House. Our record in Saskatchewan, where we have blazed the trail in co-operation, shows that. As honourable gentlemen know, I had a good deal to do with many of the measures placed on the Statute Book in that connection. So, when I oppose this legislation, it is not because I am opposed to the Farmers Co-operative Organization, nor because I am opposed to the pool. That is a strong and vigorous institution that will become very much stronger and bigger in the days to come. I wish it every success, and I am sure it will have it. My opposition is based on something entirely different. It is based on the principle that I do not believe that Parliament should interfere with capital that has been innocently and legitimately invested. It is not capital that was invested fifteen or twenty years ago; we know of instances of people putting their money into those institutions within recent years—probably within the last few days. Those institutions, in my judgment, have been built up under a system of law whereby the privately owned country elevator could send the grain that came to it to its own terminal elevator. But you now ask that Parliament should with a sweep of the hand take away from those privately-owned country elevators the right to send the grain to their own terminal elevators. You go further than that, and place in the hands of the organized farmers, as I said yesterday, a club that can be used, and used effectively, to kill any privately-owned terminal elevator at the head of the lakes. That is my opinion. I may not be right, but all of the evidence submitted to the Committee and all the discussions that I have had in this connection lead nowhere else.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: Just a moment. In the event of the pool people acquiring elevators at all the points throughout the West, would not the same thing be accomplished? Would it not destroy the money investment at Fort William and other points within the course of a comparatively short time?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Surely. I say surely, and let it; but do not ask me to create a law to do it.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: The honourable gentleman in the beginning of his speech argued to the effect that there was no reason why the pool people could not acquire elevators at all initial points.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: And I argue that now. They have the right to do so under the