

Wood. He did not send that one himself. He sent one himself to the manager of the Saskatchewan Grain Pool and another to the manager of the Manitoba Grain Pool. He had received no answers to any of them when I last saw him. Therefore I feel that we are no farther on in our disposition of the Bill than unfortunately we were last night. I desired to present these facts to the House. I think it would be in the interests of all parties to adjourn until at least the afternoon, but that is for the House to say.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The statement is made in that telegram by the honourable member from Moose Jaw that there is considerable opposition to the Bill as introduced. That is his opinion. It has not been very clearly demonstrated to this Chamber what is the extent of that opposition, and the attitude of the grain growers of the West in giving their opinion upon those amendments will necessarily be conditioned upon the danger of the Bill not passing. I am myself in a similar position. I will strive, either now or this afternoon, to have the Senate declare itself upon the Bill as it stands. I am myself ready to examine into the desirability of accepting amendments if I cannot get the Bill adopted by this Chamber in its present form; but I am not ready to accept amendments of any kind before I know that there is not a majority in this Chamber to pass that Bill.

Hon. Mr. SHARPE: In other words, my honourable friend is willing to make as much political capital out of it as possible.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Well, I will answer my honourable friend right away.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: Honourable gentlemen, while the honourable leader of the Opposition is getting his ammunition ready, will you permit me to say—

Hon. Mr. WATSON: He is ready now.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Sharpe) speaks of political capital. Here is what I read in the Montreal Gazette of yesterday morning:

Saskatoon, June 30.—The following message was sent to John Evans, Progressive member for Rosetown, and signed J. T. Douglas, secretary, on behalf of the Rosetown Federal Progressive Executive:

"Feel confident that you will continue to support principles. Oppose bargaining with either party. Advocate supporting any government with Progressive legislation. Do not hesitate to vote out Tories, even at expense of the Campbell amendment on rural credits. Election inevitable. Rosetown ready. Recommend get on Hansard Progressive insistence on judicial inquiry of customs probe."

That indicates that the Rural Credits measure and this Bill have a bearing upon

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY.

the political situation in this country. I allowed my honourable friend (Hon. G. G. Foster) yesterday to state what had taken place in the Committee, but he did not state that on the afternoon or evening of Tuesday, the 22nd of June, when we met to consider that Bill after we had already held two sittings, a motion was made to hear the Grain Commissioners on the first clause. When it was declared by all the parties that we did not need the Grain Commissioners on that clause, I objected to the motion, because I felt that it would make for too long a delay, which would be looked upon with suspicion by the country. As a matter of fact, on the Monday evening, when passing through Toronto, I had seen that the majority in the Commons would be affected by the way the Grain Act was dealt with. I did not raise that question before the Committee. On Tuesday morning at half-past ten the honourable gentleman from Middleton (Hon. W. B. Ross) asked that the Committee adjourn in order that our friends of the Conservative Party might go into caucus. I took it for granted that they went into caucus with the Commoners. In the evening, after that caucus, there seemed to be a desire to postpone the consideration of this Bill. The Grain Commissioners were called, although both parties had declared that they did not need the Grain Commissioners, and we lost three or four days. Here we are in the throes of a political crisis, with this Grain Act before us. I should have liked the Senate to dispose of it much earlier in order that the suspicion might be avoided that the Senate's action was affected by a situation existing elsewhere. I had to bow to the decision of the majority. I recognize that when, in the following week, my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster) said that on the second clause he desired to hear the Grain Commissioners, the point was well taken; but it was not well taken on the first clause on that Tuesday, when both parties had declared that they did not need the Grain Commissioners. I felt that the Senate would be open to attack for this dilatoriness in dealing with the Bill when there was a crisis elsewhere. And I desire to tell my honourable friend that I do not accept the imputation that I am making any political capital. I want to remind him of the fact that this Bill has come from the Commons with the unanimous approval of that House, his leaders supporting it and voting for it. Here we have before us a very simple question. Shall the Grain Act be changed to what the grain growers want? Shall it be clarified as Mr. Justice Turgeon