

pete with private enterprise. Has the hon. Postmaster General been so long in his office that he does not know that he is competing with private enterprise in the Post Office Department at the present time in the forwarding of parcels? Does he not know that he is competing with private enterprise in carrying on a savings bank business? Does he not know that the government is competing with private enterprise in its binder twine factory and in its railways? I did suggest the proposal as a project that the government should immediately enter into; I suggested it as a project that the government should consider, and I pointed out that in the western states there was practically state-ownership of elevators, and that when farmers put their grain into these elevators they received a certificate to which the credit of the state is attached. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but I am so informed. I have not had an opportunity of investigating the subject carefully.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not know that there are in the grain-growing states of Minnesota, Dakota, Wisconsin or Iowa state-owned elevators. There are farmers' elevators, but I know of no state-owned elevators.

Mr. SPROULE Are there none at Duluth?

Mr. McCREARY. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has perhaps misunderstood me a little. I do not think my information went so far as to say that there are state-owned elevators, but my understanding is the state takes such control over them that the certificates issued for grain deposited in these elevators bear upon them the stamp of the state, that farmers receiving these certificates can look to the whole credit of the state to see that they are paid and that, in fact, they are practically regarded as negotiable instruments by the farmers of the west. I would defer to the superior knowledge of my hon. friend from Selkirk in regard to that, but I am informed by people who profess to be conversant with the facts that such a condition exists in some of the western states, and possibly that information may agree, to some extent, with the information that my hon. friend has upon that point. I would not suppose that it was a very radical thing after all to suggest that the government should consider the economic saving in providing elevators or warehouses at a minimum cost, instead of having farmers themselves provide them at a minimum cost. I think perhaps my hon. friend from Selkirk will agree with me in that view, although he may have some modifications to suggest. For example, if it should cost a cent a bushel to warehouse grain for a certain period of time, and if by such assistance as the government could give to the

farmers of the west that grain could be stored for a quarter of a cent a bushel during the same period of time, surely a suggestion of that kind is not so utterly absurd that the government should not take it into consideration. That was all I asked. I did not put this forward as a proposal. I put it forward as something which I thought the government should consider. I adhere absolutely to that opinion, notwithstanding the sneer of the hon. Postmaster General, and I think it is a suggestion which the government will have to take into consideration in the, not very distant future.

The hon. Postmaster General, after demolishing very much to his own satisfaction, my proposal, proceeded to deal with the line from Quebec to Moncton. He includes, in the cost of my proposal, for his part of the scheme, \$10,000,000. I believe I did, in addressing the House somewhat hurriedly the other day, near six o'clock, speak of a line from Lévis to Moncton. I was not aware that I had done so until I was afterwards informed of it by the hon. Minister of Justice, and having been informed of it by the hon. Minister of Justice in the course of his speech, I said that I intended the line to run from Rivière du Loup to Moncton, because Rivière du Loup brings you past the extremity of the state of Maine, and, according to my view, you can make just as short a line by building from Rivière du Loup to Moncton by the best practicable route, as by building a new line from Lévis to Moncton. Whatever necessity there may be for colonization roads through the rear parishes of the counties of St. Lawrence, I do not know. If there is any need of colonization roads, I would be prepared to give it all due consideration; but for the project of a short line from Lévis to Moncton, what I intended to propose was a line from Rivière du Loup to Moncton, if it would give the people of the maritime provinces and the maritime ports a better fighting chance for the trade of the west, and I so expressed myself in my speech. I propose to build this line as a part of the Intercolonial Railway, to keep it as a part of the people's railway, and not to hand it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, no doubt through inadvertence, puts in the whole line from Lévis to Moncton, and charges my scheme with \$10,000,000 as the cost of that line.

Let us bear in mind just this. The whole enterprise of the government is to cost \$13,000,000; that whole enterprise of the government includes this line which according to the Postmaster General is to cost \$10,000,000 in my proposal; therefore, if you eliminate this \$10,000,000, you have \$3,000,000 left for the construction of all the other lines proposed by the government. That is a fair argument, is it not? This section is included in the proposal of the Postmaster General which is to cost \$13,