

that certain influences were brought to bear to increase that prejudice and distrust. I also said that after the first returns were made this suspicion disappeared.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: But this was as late as June, 1920, when the re-establishment of the Board was under consideration in the House. There were statements made by farmers from the West on the floor of Parliament to the effect that this was the general opinion.

Mr. ROBINSON: I am not responsible for what hon. members say in the House.

Mr. GARLAND: I am not sure whether I got the question which the hon. gentleman has just asked, but was it to the effect that there was some dissatisfaction with the Wheat Board, and did I understand you to say in reply to him that at the inception, at one time, there was dissatisfaction but that now there is not?

Mr. ROBINSON: That is my view exactly. I had an experience last Friday that might interest you. A gentleman came to where I was sitting and said: "I say, Robinson, do you think we are going to get the Wheat Board?" I said, "I do not know; I know the Council of Agriculture will press for it to the best of their ability." He said, "Well, I hope you get it." This man was a farmer, an educated and intelligent man. As a matter of fact, he is a college graduate, a veterinary surgeon. He said: "I sent to submit something. I would like to see the Wheat Board re-established even if I do not get one cent more for my crop. It would relieve me of something that is a serious annoyance. I have to-day two cars of wheat at Fort William, and I do not know whether I should sell to-day or wait for a week or for a month; but if the Wheat Board was in existence I would take that wheat to the elevator, receive the advance and feel sure that that wheat would be sold to the best possible advantage. The chances are that I will instruct that wheat to be sold on a day when the prices are off and then I will feel like kicking myself for weeks because I did not wait longer." Now, I think that that is a fair illustration of the effect in giving confidence to the farmers, should the Wheat Board be re-established.

Mr. MILLAR: You have not touched on the effect it would have on the fall work.

Mr. ROBINSON: That is another thing. It would be of great advantage to the farmer and would mean a very noticeable increase in the acreage. Take the farmer who is living ten, twenty or twenty-five miles from the railway. As soon as he threshes he is forced to start hauling his grain, and that occupies his time when he should be preparing the land for the following year's crop. It would have a further effect in lessening the great rush during the three months of October, November and December. The creditors of the man who is living away from the railway would know that he was going to get the same price whether he delivered his grain or his wheat in September or in the following May.

Mr. GARLAND: Have you anything to say as to the transportation companies, as to the spreading out of deliveries? Would it affect that in your opinion?

Mr. ROBINSON: It certainly would. To those who are not familiar with the West I may explain that practically every year there is a serious blockade so far as the moving of the grain is concerned, and I think that that will continue for all time, so long as we are making grain growing the main portion of farm work. Now, it is not fair to expect any transportation company to move an entire season's crop within three or four months. If they are forced to do that, I think the cost of transportation would be higher; and if by regulating the delivery of the grain we could spread that out over a longer period then the railway companies would be in a better position to haul the grain for us.

Mr. BROWN: Is it not a fact that along the line of the C.N.R. there was a time last year when buyers were paying a much lower price than on the C.P.R. because of the lack of transportation?

[Mr. James Robinson.]