

Q. Then how does it lose its identity?—A. Because it goes from one elevator to another and is mixed with American grain. The grain that is in an elevator in Buffalo is not all Canadian grain, but all the grain in Fort William and Port Arthur is Canadian grain. There is no American grain in those elevators, but when you get to Buffalo you get it mixed with American grain, and it goes down in bond, say, to Philadelphia, but it does not come out as the identical grain.

Q. Would the Canadian shipper guarantee in Buffalo that his grain was maintaining its identity as Canadian grain?—A. No.

Q. Why so?—A. Because he cannot guarantee that he will have the identical grain in New York; it may be somebody else's grain.

*By Hon. Mr. Webster:*

Q. We have a certain grade?—A. Yes; but the American grades are different; but the grade of our own is given.

Q. In Fort William the identical grain goes into the vessel?—A. Yes, but the grades you have in Canada are higher than they are in the United States. I have seen grain shipped from New York that was supposed to be first class grain, that was in the most disgraceful condition. I don't wonder at the people objecting to grain, because it was full of dust and all kinds of stuff, and that was American grain that had passed inspection, but it would never pass in Montreal or St. John. What I say is that every bushel of grain, when it goes to America, loses its identity as Canadian grain; and that is a detriment to Canada, because the American mixes it with American grain. That is what the Government should impress upon the farmer—that while he gets the price in Canada, and won't get any better price than the current price from day to day—where the farmer can benefit is to have the grain sent to our Canadian ports, and carrying the grain as Canadian grain from our Canadian ports.

*By Hon. Mr. Bennett:*

Q. Can you make any suggestions how Canada should endeavour, in the winter months, after Montreal port is closed, to consolidate as much of the north west grain trade as possible through Portland—because if it goes through Portland it is going over a Government railway?—A. That is a point I have advocated from the very commencement. I say you should use Portland, because it is the cheapest port, its terminals belong to the Grand Trunk a Canadian railroad, and ninety-nine per cent of the export of Portland is Canadian, the terminals are under the control of the Grand Trunk, it is just as much a Canadian port, from an export standpoint, as St. John and Halifax. It is simply losing money for sentimental reasons when we do not use Portland as our best port, where we can compete with any other port and make money for the railways. No money is to be made in carrying grain by endeavouring to run it uphill a few miles further. Portland is the best port on the Atlantic, bar none, for export of grain. I have operated personally from Portland for a number of years. I have elected to run from Portland without a subsidy rather than go to St. John with a subsidy on account of the danger of navigation.

*By Hon. Mr. Webster:*

Q. But if all our exports were taken away from St. John, it would seriously affect Portland?—A. No; I maintain that we are not developing our ports to the maximum of their capacity. St. John gets nothing in the summer time, and Portland gets nothing in the summer time. It would be infinitely better to allow our western grain to go to Portland rather than New York and Baltimore and Philadelphia—I am only specifying the particular port we are interested in.

Q. But if the same effort that was used to build up Portland was expended on the St. John and Halifax in the winter months could we not build up St. John considerably, and have the circulation of money and the disbursements of the steamers