

Mr. ROBB: I should not like to press for the third reading now as the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is not in his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the House.

SUPPLY

TRADE AND COMMERCE

The House in committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—local services— vote 180—Baddeck and Iona, steam service between, \$10,500.

Mr. LUCAS: Where is this service carried on?

Mr. ROBB: This is down along the coast of the Bras d'Or lakes in Cape Breton. It is one of those points where they have no railway communication.

Mr. BROWN: Have they a mail carrying contract?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: Are they paid extra for carrying the mails?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Item agreed to.

Trade and Commerce—Canada Grain Act, administration of, \$1,100,000.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that the elevator at Vancouver is under the control of the Harbour Board, and that the Grain Commission have very little to do with it. Is it the intention of the minister to allow that elevator to remain under the control of the Harbour Board, or will it be put back under the Grain Commission?

Hon. T. A. LOW (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The operation of the elevator is under the control of the Harbour Board. The weighing and inspection is under the control of the Canada Grain Board.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the control of rates under the Grain Commission or under the Harbour Board?

Mr. LOW: The rate is fixed by the Harbour Board, which operates under the Marine and Fisheries department.

Mr. GARDINER: Without any reference to the Board of Grain Commissioners?

Mr. LOW: Yes, without any reference to them.

Mr. GARDINER: What rates are being charged for handling grain at that point?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. LOW: That comes under the Marine and Fisheries department. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be able to give my hon. friend the information he asks for.

Mr. SALES: Is it not a dangerous thing to create a harbour board and give them a virtual monopoly of the whole of the business, nobody else having anything to say as to what rates they shall charge? It seems very unfair that all the elevators at the head of the lakes should be under the Grain Commission and have their rates fixed while in the case of other elevators the Harbour Board should have control. Take the port of Montreal, for instance: the receipts last year were \$1,630,745.39, and the operating expenses \$689,855.03, leaving a balance over and above operations of \$940,890.36. That is, more than half the total revenue at the port of Montreal is derived from the handling of grain. It is not in the interests of the farmers that harbour boards should have the sole power in these matters; that nobody should have the right to regulate their rates. So far as I can find, no report is issued by harbour boards such as those at Montreal and Vancouver. I do not agree with the minister that this should not come under his department. I do not see how the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have anything to do with the handling of grain.

Mr. LOW: The Montreal Harbour Board handles large quantities of American grain, so that much of the earnings would come from that source. As to the fixing of rates, that is subject to the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GARDINER: Under present legislation a certain percentage of the overages goes to the federal government. Have there been any overages in the Vancouver elevator, and if so what is their amount?

Mr. LOW: There has not been an official weighing since the Harbour Board took over the elevator. There will be one, though, in the course of the year.

Mr. WARNER: How do the charges at Vancouver for the handling of grain correspond with those at Montreal and the lake ports?

Mr. LOW: I am informed that they are slightly less than at Montreal. I am not altogether sure, but that is my information.

Mr. KNOX: What are the charges per bushel at each port?

Mr. LOW: If my hon. friend will put that question to the Minister of Marine and