

I need not repeat that they considered that there were profits in the mixing of grain and in the premiums which were being received and did not come to them. They are proceeding to demonstrate, or they believe after one or two seasons that they have already demonstrated, that there are profits there that should come to them. This appeals to me. We have been talking at this Session and in past Sessions of things that might benefit the West and the Western farmer. We have passed the Farm Loan Bill.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD: It appeals to all of us just as much as it appeals to the honourable gentleman.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes, it appeals to all. The grain trade say that the country elevator does not pay them; that it means a loss to them; that they are not receiving a sufficient fee for the reception of grain at the elevator. They insist that the country elevator—

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Right there, may I say that I happened to be in the Committee part of the time, and my understanding was that Chief Justice Turgeon had stated that the country elevators made a profit of four-fifths of a cent per bushel.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes, but the grain trade have claimed that that was not a sufficient return—a paying rate.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I see.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: And they have insisted upon recouping themselves at the terminals. I say, all right, they may recoup themselves at the terminals for the grain that is their own. We have been told that the purpose in building those country elevators was first to purchase the grain and then to transport it to the terminals. On all the grain that they control, by purchase or otherwise, they are welcome to all the profits that they can get from the turnover; but it is not all right when they say, "We will control the grain that is not ours and will take the profits on it as if it were our own grain." If they were content to do simply an elevating business in the terminals at the head of the Lakes, we could understand their operations; but they are not simply doing an elevating business at those terminals and unloading the grain into the boats. They perform other operations while in possession of that grain, and that is the reason why the farmer is striving to retain the ownership of the grain up to the moment when it is sold at that point.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

I heard Mr. Pitblado explain that the law before 1925 had for its object to allow the farmer freedom to chose his terminal point, but not the terminal elevator. Mr. Pitblado made on that point a disquisition which seemed fairly logical. I tried to grasp the essential elements of his argument and to apply his statement to the Act itself. I tried to get a copy of his opinion: I could not get it. But when I look at the Grain Act I am at a loss to understand upon what clauses Mr. Pitblado founded his argument, for I do not see any point corroborating the argument that he made. On the contrary, I find in section 159 that "if either party so desires"—that is, the farmer, or, if the farmer does not express any wish, the grain company—the grain is deliverable

—on track at any terminal elevator in the Western Inspection Division, on the line of railway upon which the receiving country elevator is situate, or any line connecting therewith, so soon as the transportation company delivers the same at such terminal, and the certificate of grade and weight is returned.

I have read simply a phrase from section 159. Perhaps I should read the section at length:

Such receipt shall also state—

That is, the receipt which the farmer gets at the country elevator—

—upon its face that the grain mentioned therein has been received into store, and that upon the return of such receipt, and upon payment or tender of payment of all lawful charges for receiving, storing, insuring, delivering or otherwise handling such grain, which may accrue up to the time of the return of the receipt, the grain is deliverable to the person on whose account it has been taken into store, or to his order, from the country elevator where it was received for storage, or, if either party so desires, in quantities not less than carload lots, on track at any terminal elevator in the Western Inspection Division.

Not to any terminal point, but to any terminal elevator in the Western Inspection Division. And the receipt he gets contains also this same phrase:

Upon the return of this receipt and tender or payment of above named charges accruing up to the time of the return of this receipt, the above quantity, grade and kind of grain will be delivered, within the time prescribed by law, to the person above named or his order, either from this elevator or warehouse, or, if either party desires, in quantities of not less than carload lots at any terminal elevator in the Western Inspection Division.

Not to any terminal point, but to any terminal elevator in the Western Inspection Division.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: What construction would the honourable gentleman put upon those words, "if either party desires"?