

at 830 points, so that you will note there are 1,300 points at which there are no pool elevators, and yet all pool farmers are required, under their contract, to deliver to pool elevators.

Hon. Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is not exactly right.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: Pool terminals.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: Pool terminal elevators. The question naturally arises: how can they possibly deliver through 1,300 points where they have no facilities? Now, this is where the proposed Bill No. 8 comes in.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: The junior Senator from Moose Jaw (Hon. Mr. Calder) put the figure at 892.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: I heard the figures which he gave, but, with all deference, I am satisfied that mine are correct.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: If the honourable gentleman will allow me, I will explain the discrepancy. I do not remember our getting any evidence as to the number of sidings. I said that there were 1,717 railway stations in the three Prairie Provinces. I had no recollection of any evidence as to the number of sidings, or places where there is no station agent at all.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: You are dealing with sidings?

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: Yes.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: There are 400 sidings?

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: I understand after consultation that it is estimated there are 400 sidings.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That did not come out in the evidence, and I based my figures on the evidence.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: It is not essential anyway. The question naturally arises, how can they possibly deliver through 1,300 points where they have no facilities. It is impossible for the pool to construct elevators at these 1,300 points this year, or for several years to come, and in order to make it possible for the pool farmers to comply with their contracts, the proposed legislation has been brought down. Not having the necessary facilities themselves, they want, by this legislation, to compel the line elevators which are represented at these 1,300 points, to give facilities to the pool farmer at these thirteen hundred points, and this is where the bone of contention arises.

Now as to the bill itself. This Bill No. 8 deals exclusively with getting grain out of the country elevator once it is in, and to understand its provisions we must first understand how grain is put into the elevator. I am now referring to graded grain in general bins, which is the main class of grain affected by this legislation. When a farmer puts his grain into the country elevator, he receives from the operator a grain ticket which states on its face that upon payment of charges, the grain will be delivered to the farmer either at the country elevator or at any terminal point the farmer may desire.

Now, how does he get his grain out of the elevator?

This is one of the material points in this whole controversy. If he takes delivery at the country elevator, he gets no guarantee of grades and weights, although his grain ticket provides for such; he must be satisfied with an affidavit of the operator that he loaded into the farmer's car the same quantity and the same grade as he received in. This is the law as it stands to-day. By this Bill Number 8 it is proposed that, although the farmer takes delivery of his carload, and himself ships it to a terminal elevator of his own choice, the country elevator shall be responsible for any loss in weight or grades en route. This is the first point on which the contending parties clash.

The other controversial question arises in case the farmer wants delivery of his grain at a terminal point, and not at the country elevator. By this Bill No. 8 he seeks to compel the elevator company to deliver his carload of grain at any particular terminal elevator at a terminal point, which he himself may designate or choose.

Now, what is the argument on both sides? The pool interests claim that the farmer owns the grain, that the elevator company is simply his agent, and that he should have the right to control his own property, and to say what terminal elevator his grain should be sent to. He also claims that he had this right by law for twenty-five years, that such right was taken away from him by last year's legislation, and he is now simply asking that it be restored to him; that the elevator company is not prejudiced in any way because its representatives have the right to be present when the grain is inspected at Winnipeg, and a Government weighmaster weighs it at any terminal elevator. The grain trade, on the contrary, claim that the farmer has had the right for twenty-five years, and still has, to name the terminal point to which his grain shall be sent, but not the terminal elevator, as provided for in Bill No. 8; that the proposed