

Mr. GOULD: What is the estimated capacity of this elevator that is being erected at Halifax?

Mr. LOW: One million bushels.

Mr. GOULD: And what is the estimated cost?

Mr. LOW: It will be \$622,500.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): Is the present elevator at Halifax under the control of the department?

Mr. LOW: No.

Mr. BLACK (Halifax): It is a small one, capable of handling grain, and I believe it is part of the railway equipment.

Mr. LOW: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: When this elevator passes into the control of the railways, will the department or the minister see that the control of fees is retained in the Board of Grain Commissioners? Will the railways take over the capital charge, as the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners did?

Mr. LOW: The hon. gentleman misunderstood me; I did not intimate that the elevator at Halifax would pass into the control of the railways.

Mr. STEVENS: It will remain under the control of the department?

Mr. LOW: That is the intention.

Mr. GOULD: Was a specification submitted and were tenders called for?

Mr. LOW: Tenders were called for and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: How much was spent of last year's \$200,000?

Mr. LOW: The amount expended was \$19,983.

Mr. SALES: Who is the engineer for the Halifax elevator?

Mr. LOW: The engineers are J. S. Metcalf & Company of Montreal.

Mr. SALES: Again I feel I must protest against the cost of these elevators. One was built some time ago at Vancouver at a cost of ninety cents per bushel capacity at the same time that elevators were being built at the head of the lakes at a cost of twenty-three cents. Now we have in the case of this million bushel elevator a cost of 62½ cents per bushel capacity. I do not understand why there should be this discrepancy; I do not see why an elevator should cost so much more at Vancouver than one at the head of the lakes.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the hon. member refer to No. 1?

Mr. SALES: The one we dealt with in this House two years ago; it was an addition and cost something like ninety cents per bushel.

Mr. STEVENS: Twice as much as the original one.

Mr. SALES: Yes; I am pleased to be supported by the hon. member again. I protested at that time and informed the government that elevators were being built then at a cost of twenty-three cents per bushel capacity. In the case of that expensive elevator Metcalf & Company were the engineers. I pointed out to the government on that occasion that a certain gentleman was constructing practically all the elevators in the western country at the head of the lakes and had been employed by the government formerly; and that gentleman I understand was the engineer for the Edmonton elevator. I should like to know what was the cost of the Edmonton elevator per bushel capacity, for the purpose of comparing the figures of one firm with those of the other. There seems to be some extravagance here.

Mr. LOW: The capital cost of the Edmonton elevator is \$1,462,601.17 and the capacity is 2,500,000 bushels.

Mr. GOULD: Was there a tender in that case?

Mr. LOW: Yes; the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. GARDINER: What possibility is there of grain passing through the elevator at Halifax, and have any arrangements been made to give a freight rate that will induce the shipment of grain through that elevator?

Mr. LOW: The fixing of rates by rail is of course a matter for the Canadian National Railways, but I have no doubt, so far as water is concerned, that the elevator will be taken advantage of, as vessels are always glad to get wheat as ballast.

Mr. GARDINER: Personally I have no objection to the building of an elevator at Halifax provided business will go that way, but I think it is a very stupid policy to build an elevator there unless we are assured that grain will go through that port. I think we should have that assurance before passing this item; otherwise the minister should take up the whole question with the railway officials to find out just where he stands.