Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I would say that the owner of the grain, when he brings it to the country elevator, can declare where he wants it to go. If he has expressed his desire, I would say that that is the law. The elevator agent may then accept or refuse the farmer's grain, but if he accepts it under that condition he accepts the desire that has been intimated to him on taking possession of the grain.

The clause I have just read relates to the storage receipt. Schedule C, "storage receipt for special binned grain," contains the same condition:

—if either party so desires, in quantities of not less than carload lots at any terminal elevator in the Western Inspection Division.

That was the law up to 1925. If either party so desired, the grain went to a certain —to any—terminal elevator. That provision was not utilized to a considerable extent up to 1923, but it was utilized. Four or five members of the House of Commons come and tell us that they have exercized that right—that they have expressed their preference, and that it has not been challenged. We have there an indication of a practice that must surely prevail to a degree beyond the 2 per cent which Mr. Pitblado mentioned. He said that 98 per cent of the grain came in from the country elevator without any attempt at direction by the farmer. Well, when a few farmer members come here and say, "Our practice has been such-and-such," it seems to me that it must have existed to a considerable extent throughout the West. The farmers have organized to keep control of their grain, and when they are purchasing country elevators and terminal elevators and desire to exercise that right, Parliament intervenes and says, "You shall not exercise it." Just at the moment when the farmers in very large numbers and for a very large amount of grain are about to make use of that privilege, there comes this change.

And how does it come about? In a most extraordinary way. Here is a Commission presided over by Mr. Justice Turgeon, of Saskatchewan, who has had a very large experience in the West, having been there certainly a quarter of a century, and who knows the conditions. He is asked to frame a Bill to be presented to Parliament, and he happens to strike that very question of the right of the farmer to indicate the terminal. The Grain Commissioners say: "Our intention was to make sure that the farmer would have the right to select his terminal point, either Vancouver or Fort William." But Mr. Justice Turgeon does not see it in that light, and he wants to clarify the Act. Of that expression, "if either party so desires," what does he say? Speaking of the farmer, he says, "if he so desires." The desire of Mr. Justice Turgeon is to clarify the provision in the interest of the farmer's right. The Bill comes before us. We clarify the condition, but do so in the interest of the grain-elevating people. That is what we do.

Now, I claim that the law allowed a certain right to the grain-grower. He exercised that right. I would like to be shown what other construction can be put upon this clause 159 than the construction which I have put upon it in reading it, namely, that if either party desired, a certain terminal elevator could be selected by preference. Surely a joint right existed. The question has been put to me, who had the first opportunity of exercising that right? I say the owner of the merchandise, when he brought it to the country elevator. The effect of the present Bill is simply to recognize the right of the farmer, but to make it clear in the way recommended by Mr. Justice Turgeon. I claim that that is the fair interpretation to give to the law as it existed prior to 1925.

In the ordinary course of business one has to meet new conditions which are very detrimental. A business may be prosperous up to a certain time; then it may meet competition in the form of new inventions, and it goes by the board. The grain trade are facing competition. But they are organized. They have their terminal elevators, they have feeders, and they still control a large quantity of the grain, which will move from their country elevators to their terminals. If this Bill passes they will simply face a very important client with whom they will have to deal. I think it is recognized that the pool at present have not the necessary capacity at Fort William or Port Arthur to handle all their grain. Those other companies will surely be required under contract to handle part of the grain belonging to the pool. They did so last year, under contract. I am sure they are desirous of coming to terms with the pool interests as quickly as possible, in order that their rivals may not build alongside of them in the country and at the terminals.

It has been argued that the pool will play one terminal company against another—that they will starve A while feeding B and C. Well, the terminal elevator companies are composed of business men, and I should not be surprised to hear that they had some general understanding amongst themselves. If they have not, they can come to an understanding. Surely by coming together they