

having marketed 1,600 bushels of grain in the year 1880, I know something about it. We had no elevators at that time, and through lack of them, and lack of licenses for grain dealers to buy, I did not get one dollar, not one cent, for my 1,600 bushels that I had plowed and sowed and reaped and threshed largely with my own hands; so I lost my 1,600 bushels of wheat.

The farmer's row has been a hard one, as my honourable friend from Compton (Hon. Mr. Pope) stated the other day. The farmers have had an uphill row to hoe, but they have kept hoeing until they have now got into a better position through this pool, by which they think they can handle their wheat and get all the profits out of it. They wish to put their wheat through pool elevators, of which there is a legitimate number, and they are willing to pay such price to the grain elevators for their work as will be sufficient to make the elevators pay. But if two or three elevators are built where there ought to be one, there will not be sufficient revenue to make all of them pay. Should the farmer be punished for over-building? I say no. I say, let the farmer get his fair share of his own wheat.

What do the people of the Prairie Provinces think of this Bill? From all I have heard I believe that 95 per cent of the people of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are in favour of it, and they do not believe for one moment that they are doing an injustice to the grain men, or confiscating their money. As Mr. Burnell said when speaking in Committee about making the farmers purchase the elevators, they have paid for them already, some of them several times. From my own experience I know that in many cases grain men have paid for their elevator in one year, and paid for it out of the money of the farmers. In my little town where there were only a couple of hundred people, where we knew pretty well what was going on in all the elevators, an elevator man, whose building had not cost more than \$8,000 or \$9,000 in those days when construction was cheap, told me that after the season was over and the wheat was all shipped out he had 3,000 bushels surplus. I never mentioned this before, because I thought the elevator man did not want it spoken of. That was a year when we had first-class wheat, but I do not remember anything about the grades; there was no talk about grades at that time, away back in the early nineties. Many of the elevator companies have paid for the elevator in one year, and that is what made them so ready to go on building elevators when they were not sure of getting a great amount of

wheat to handle. Why should the farmer be put up against a proposition of that kind? And why should we, by legislation, want to make him pay for that?

I voted for last year's Bill. I did not understand it, but I went to a man in whom I had the greatest confidence, and I saw my own leader in the other House was supporting the amendment that was put in last year, and my friends said it was all right. But according to Mr. Pitblado the whole onus of that last year's Bill is put on Mr. Crerar and Mr. Forke. Mr. Forke has repented of his sin, if it was a sin to vote for that; he has repented of his action, at all events, and he supported the Bill of this year cancelling the clause that was inserted last year. Mr. Crerar was down here, and canvassed for the Bill last year, and I think the statement is true that it was largely through his influence that last year's amendment was passed; but we do not find him down here this year, and do not find him writing to his friends asking them to see that that amendment is not repealed. Why? Because, being a good and honest man, he sees that it was a mistake. It has been said that a fool never changes his mind, but that a wise man does so sometimes. Well, evidently Mr. Crerar has changed his mind; certainly Mr. Forke has, and the House of Commons has done so all through, because this Bill before us, as it came to us, had passed through the Committee of Agriculture in the House of Commons, which has 100 members, and the Bill got all its readings in the House of Commons without a single vote against it.

Now, honourable gentlemen, are we going to vote against this Bill? I am one of those Senators who believe in the absolute independence of the Senate, uncontrolled in any way by anyone, or by the House of Commons. Ever since I came here I have taken my own course, not caring much who it pleased or who it did not please. If I think a Bill is right I support it. When a Bill comes from the House of Commons I always say to myself: "Well, what will you do, my boy, if you are called upon to explain your action?" And as I take my course and say to myself: "Now, if you are called upon to defend that action in any part of Canada what position can you take?" Unless I can say to myself, and feel, that I can defend my course successfully I will not vote against the wishes of the elected representatives; but if I feel that the Bill is not just, and that I could not defend passing it, I do not hesitate at all to vote against it, and I do not object to any man voting against any Bill that comes before us here.