permitted to put their grain through the line elevators to the disadvantage of the non-pool farmer, and also to disadvantage of the elevator people so far as their service to the whole community is concerned.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: In my judgment there is a point in the question asked by the honourable member for Assiniboia (Hon. Mr. Turriff). We must put the boot on the other foot. At present the pool has in the neighbourhood of 20,000,000 capacity at the head of the Lakes. I dare say they claim that they require that capacity for the number of elevators they now have; we must assume that. The greater proportion of that capacity came from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company. Now, let us assume, for argument's sake, that they buy 500 country elevators. Will they, in turn, have sufficient terminal facilities to handle the grain that would come from those additional 500 elevators? There is a possibility that they would not. Just as I argued for the other protection, I am going to argue now. If they have not sufficient capacity to handle the grain coming from the 500 additional country elevators that they purchased, then I must say I have not grasped the full force of this amendment. But if in turn, through the Board of Grain Commissioners, they should have the right to acquire such proportionate space in those privately-owned terminal elevators as is necessary to take care of their share of the grain, I think that is a matter that could very easily be arranged by the Board of Grain Commissioners and the trade.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Is it not correct to say that during the rush season for handling grain it often occurs now that when one elevator at a terminal point is full, be it a pool or non-pool elevator, that grain is diverted by agreement, or by order of the Grain Commission, so that no congestion is permitted to occur at terminals so long as there is elevator space available, either pool or non-pool?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That is not the point. I quite agree that the grain is taken care of in some way; but now I am going to assume, and I think I am right in my assumption, that the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company did not build more terminal space than was necessary for its line elevators, some 450, the bulk of which elevators are now owned by the pool. We must assume that they have not built more space than was necessary. Now we assume that the pool may go out and purchase or acquire in some way 500 additional country elevators.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Or 1,000.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Or 1,000, and they in turn have the necessary terminal facilities to take care of the grain that comes through their elevators. My argument was all the other way—that we had no right to step in and compel privately-owned elevators to take care of pool grain; but I am prepared to argue now that the pool should be placed in a position where it will be required to have terminal elevators to take care of its grain. So I think there should be an amendment made to the effect that if that condition arises, the Board of Grain Commissioners should have the right to step in and adjust that situation.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Have we not had the statement in the Committee that with the limited number of country elevators which the pool had, they sent out far more wheat than their terminal elevators could take care of, and that a very large proportion went over to the private elevators?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That was because of the contract which the pool made with the grain trade. Under that contract every elevator in Western Canada gathers grain for the pool, and the pool has not sufficient terminal facilities to take care of that grain which it gathers from private country elevators. That was the reason why they had to turn over to private terminals a very large proportion of the grain belonging to their members.

At 6 o'clock the Committee took recess.

---

The Committee resumed at 8 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would ask the honourable gentleman from Regina (Hon. Mr. Laird) the purport of the amendment which is now before us. I can understand the first part, which reads:

> Section 1 of this Act shall not come into force until such date as may be fixed by the Governor in Council by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette.

But what is the idea of limiting the operation of this clause to one year, after which it will be null and void, and will disappear from the statute as if it had been repealed? It is very exceptional.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: I understand that the parties interested were satisfied with that and had fixed upon that formula as a settlement of one part of their dispute—that it would be in force for a year, and that after that time it would not be needed; that the Governor in Council might proclaim it at