

Mr. ENDERBY: It does to some small extent, sir, but the volume of grain figuratively thrown into the hands of the Canadian ship owner and the Canadian route and the Canadian transportation companies generally is not nearly as large as the public thinks. I believe that from fifteen to eighteen million bushels would be all that would be affected. That figure is based on the average amount of grain shipped out of New York, Baltimore and Philadelphia over the last five years.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Enderby, if our coasting law becomes such that grain cannot be carried on an American vessel to Buffalo and then reshipped to Montreal, will that not tend to increase the shipments from American ports and consequently decrease the exportation through Canadian ports? An American ship must send its cargo not to Montreal, from Buffalo, but on to New York. Will that not operate against our Canadian ports and in favour of the American ports?

Mr. ENDERBY: We cannot see it that way. If the grain is eventually to come to Montreal we can see no argument that should deprive the Canadian route of that business. And the Government are partners with us, inasmuch as they have a government elevator at Port Colborne and another at Prescott, and the grain that it has been the practice to transfer from the upper lake ship to the lower at the Port of Buffalo should be diverted into the Canadian route and give the government elevator at Port Colborne or Prescott a chance to get the business.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I agree with you that that should be the ideal situation, but would it be the result? When the grain gets to Buffalo the American shipping interests will do their utmost to see that it goes through the Erie canal down to New York, to be shipped through an American port.

Mr. ENDERBY: That depends upon the cost of moving that grain, and we will have to be content to compete with them in the matter of rates.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Is it not a fact that the terminal facilities at Montreal, including the unloading from the lake vessel, putting the grain into the elevator and from there into the ocean ships, costs less than the facilities at the port of New York?

Mr. ENDERBY: Yes.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: New York has not got the system that the port of Montreal has.

Mr. ENDERBY: I am not intimately familiar with the New York system, but most of their grain is transferred from the elevators to floating boxes, as they are known, and then transferred to the ocean steamers from those boxes, a more costly operation.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Isn't the preference that resulted from the Imperial Conference a factor that tends to deflect the business to our channels?

Mr. ENDERBY: Yes. The grain that is intended to be moved from the head of the lakes into Great Britain must travel, as we understand it under the present ruling, through an all-Canadian route.

The CHAIRMAN: That affects only grain that is going to a part of the Empire.

Mr. ENDERBY: Yes.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The question that Senator Graham put to you, Mr. Enderby, was tremendously important and I am not quite clear as to your answer. Grain men at Winnipeg, the Pool for example, have elevator facilities themselves at Buffalo. Now, your competitors are American boats, and at present they can take that grain to Buffalo and then there is the alternative of shipping via Montreal or via New York. Will not the grain firm at Winni-