

can protect themselves and make arrangements with the pool in order to prevent the pool from building other terminal elevators and from spending millions of dollars in duplicating the country plants. We have no interest in doing anything which would bring about that condition of affairs. Our farmers in the West need their money. They are not eager to spend \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 to buy country elevators and to acquire or build terminal elevators. We are not interested in allowing them to do so. We know their need for money. It has been said that Saskatchewan alone could absorb \$100,000,000 of money for use by the farmers. We are interested in the prosperity of the farmers of the West, and should do everything possible to prevent them putting their money into a duplication of elevators throughout the West. As I have said, there are already enough elevators. Let us grant the farmers the right, which they had, of declaring where they want their grain to go, and we will more surely bring these two great institutions together and save a large and useless expenditure.

To me the amendment is absolutely unacceptable. We should not give to any Government a right which appertains to Parliament. We should not put any Government in the position of an umpire or arbitrator between these two big interests. Governments are composed of human beings and are often influenced by political considerations. My honourable friend from Manitoba (Hon. Mr. McMeans) last week would have admitted the soundness of my statement; now he shakes his head as implying the opposite. Sooner than he thinks he may return to his attitude of last week.

I would perhaps be willing to accept the last part of this amendment, to make this Bill operative for one year. That would not be as disagreeable to me as the whole amendment. There might be some sense in the view that this Act should be placed on our Statute Book for a year, to see how it will operate and how the parties will deal with each other; but it would be unjust and unwise to throw upon any Government the responsibility of sitting in judgment between these two vast interests. If there is not a majority of this Chamber in favour of clarifying the Act of 1912, as suggested by Mr. Justice Turgeon, I would much prefer an amendment wiping out the clause of the Act of 1925 and re-establishing the farmers in their full rights under the Act of 1912. But I believe that we should not involve the farmers in lawsuits. If we return to the Act of 1912 without any clarification, it is very likely that lawsuits

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

would ensue, with the result, I believe, that the farmers would win. But as I feel that the farmer has a right to follow his own grain to this own terminal elevator, I am disposed to vote for the clause before us and against the amendment proposed by the honourable gentleman from Regina.

Hon. J. G. TURRIFF: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on one phase of this question that to my mind has not been dealt with to any great extent. We have heard a good deal in the Banking and Commerce Committee and in this House to the effect that the pool farmers were trying to gain an advantage over the elevator companies; that what they were really trying to get by the Bill before us amounted practically to confiscation of the rights of men who have put money into elevators throughout the country. I would like to ask the honourable members of this House: Who asked those men to come forward and put their money into elevators? It was not the farmers; it was the grain elevator men. And they are now combined into one great company.

In years gone by, more especially during the past few years, competition amongst the elevator men induced them to build elevators for the use of the farmers all through the country. They wanted to bring volume, as they said, to their business, and to my knowledge they put up elevators in towns of a few hundred people where there were already two or three elevators doing business and making money simply as internal elevators. Two or three companies would have elevators alongside one another, and if there was a good crop perhaps they would both make money. But neither of them was satisfied. And if someone else attempted to come into that town and build another elevator, what did they do? The old elevator people had a good knowledge of the surrounding country, and they turned to and built, or got someone else to build another elevator at that point in order to compete. They put their money in there with their eyes open. The lawyers may say what they like about the law as the elevator men understood it and as the farmers understood it. I say the elevator men had a perfect knowledge of that, but still they went on and built four or five elevators at a point that only justified two, and naturally five elevators could not make money where two had done so.

Did you ever hear, Mr. Chairman, of anybody being able to get rid of the embarrassment of over-building by coming to Parliament and asking permission to compensate himself for his folly? Take the case of a