

game, if I may use the expression, to that extent. But my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) gave figures showing that the Board of Grain Commissioners were really ahead to the extent of \$4,500,000. Now, I simply wish to see if I understand the facts correctly. My understanding is this: The \$94,000 which the Board of Grain Commissioners have made in their operation for the past thirteen years has reference to their direct work in seeing to the inspection of grain, sampling, and so forth. On the other hand the \$4,500,000 to which my hon. friend (Mr. Sales) refers was the money—I take it that the figures are correct—made by the Grain Commissioners in handling grain as elevator owners for the people of Canada.

Mr. SALES: Altogether, I think.

Mr. MANION: Including the \$94,000? Of course that is a small part of the \$4,500,000. At any rate that is what I understood the figures to mean. I have no interest in the question myself. I do not wish to put myself up as having a special knowledge of the subject, but being at the head of the lakes where a great deal of grain is handled I have heard the question discussed a great deal. I take it that if those figures are correct, and I presume they are, the \$4,500,000 has been made through the handling of grain through the elevators, has been made in exactly the same way as in the case of any of the other grain handling companies. For instance, the Bawlf Grain Company of Winnipeg, mentioned by one hon. member, have handled grain for a great many years and have done very well in a business way. Then too the Grain Growers' Grain Company have elevators through which they have been handling grain for some years and have been making, I think, reasonable profits. I take it, therefore, that the explanation I have given would account for the difference; that the \$4,500,000 has been made in the handling of grain through elevators, and is a separate account. I think the minister will probably support that statement in a general way without looking up the item.

The only question that comes up is this: I can understand the contention of hon. members to my left and I think they have good grounds for arguing that that \$4,500,000 should go back to the pockets of the farmers. I would thoroughly agree with them in that contention. At the same time there is the difficulty that if the Board of Grain Commissioners through their elevators changed their rates for handling grain it means that the rates will have to be the same in the case

of the other elevators, because if particular elevators have lower rates than others it is natural that everybody would wish to ship his grain through those elevators. I presume that would create a difficulty. At the same time I should like to say that I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend's suggestion that whatever profit is taken out of the grain—which really comes out of the farmers—should later go back to the farmers. I say that not because we had some little argument here last evening but because it is entirely my own view.

There is another question mentioned by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle—he stated it indirectly I thought—which has caused a good deal of discussion throughout western Canada in the past year, that is the question of sample markets. He spoke of grain bringing more money by being sold through the port of Vancouver because it was sold on sample. As I say, there has been a good deal of discussion throughout the West during the past year—partly engineered by some who wish to start a sample market—in regard to sample markets. Now, according to my understanding there is on the statute books of Canada to-day, and it has been in existence for a number of years, legislation permitting the establishment at Calgary and Fort William of sample markets! Am I not right in regard to that?

Mr. MILLAR: Will my hon. friend allow me to explain that I am very much against a sample market because such a market as established by law carries with it mixing privileges which has an evil effect at Port Arthur and Fort William at the present time. The grain that went from the port of Vancouver went from a port where there is no sample market and no mixing privileges. It was actually sold on sample. That is, after it reached Liverpool the grain was seen and its value was such that it brought five cents a bushel more than if it had been bought on grade. In that case there were no mixing privileges; it was grain that had left the farmer's wagon in its pure state.

Mr. MANION: I understand my hon. friend's point. I am not, however, thoroughly familiar with the question so I do not advance my opinion very strongly. I do not know that a sample market would necessarily imply mixing privileges. It is true that mixing is carried on at the head of the lakes at the present time, but mixing is done by the private elevators. It is not supposed to be done, according to law, at the terminal elevators. That is, not according to the Canada Grain