

common law. Let them come out and build all the terminals and all the country elevators they like; but do not ask Parliament to put them in such a position that they can do something they have not a right to do.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: It has the same effect.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: It has the same effect, but it is an entirely different thing to do it by statute.

Now, one other point. Some stress has been placed on the assumption that this law, if passed, will affect only a small percentage of the grain. Mr. Murray and Mr. Burnell placed the amount at 12 per cent of the grain now handled by the privately-owned elevators. The honourable the junior member for Moose Jaw (Hon. Mr. Willoughby) yesterday gave figures indicating that that would be the position, and the argument was that anyway it was only a small thing, as it affects only 12 per cent of the grain.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: At most.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: At most. In order to arrive at that 12 per cent, those who made the calculation based it on the assumption that one-half of the entire western crop would not be affected by this legislation. They based it on the assumption that street wheat, that is, wagon-load wheat, would not come under this law. Those who were on the Committee know what the argument in reply was. It is quite true that the pool have not used the existing contracts that they have with the trade for the purpose of getting street wheat through their terminals; but, as I heard the evidence, and as I read the present law and this proposed law, there is nothing in the world to prevent the pool from handling street wheat just the same as any other wheat. In other words, the argument is based on the assumption that "Oh, well, after all, there is only a very small fraction of this wheat to be handled in this way." I say that not only 12 per cent but 50 per cent of the crop may come under this law.

I do not know whether it is worth my while labouring this question, which is a very technical one. Dr. Magill said: "Well, if the pool will give me \$100,000, I will show them how we can handle street wheat under this law." Mr. Pitblado said that there was no question about it at all, and we had some argument as to how it could be done. Mr. Pitblado said there was no question at all that street wheat could be brought into this pool, and intimated that they had managers—grain experts and men of excellent ability—who were clever enough to do it. The result of it all was that Mr. Pitblado said:

Hon. Mr. CALDER.

"It will affect us not to the extent of 12 per cent, but to the extent of over 50 per cent." So, any argument that has been advanced that after all this is a very small thing is not, in my opinion, based upon a solid foundation.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Does the honourable gentleman know why the pool should not handle street wheat?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Not at all. I have never said that. They could handle any kind of wheat. They are entitled to do so. The honourable gentleman did not get the point at all. It is said that if this law is passed it will not affect street wheat, which is 50 per cent of the crop. He consequently falls low, when he says that, after all, the trade is affected only to the extent of 12 per cent. I say, in reply, that is not true; that the evidence goes to show that the street wheat can be brought under this law, and if it is, then not 12 per cent, but over 50 per cent of the grain handled by those private interests, will be affected.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: But does not the proposed Bill state that this only applies to carload lots?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: If the honourable gentleman is going to force me to go into a statement of how it is to be done, I will only have to repeat the statement I made in the Committee.

Hon. Mr. GILLIS: But the Bill distinctly states that it shall only apply to carload lots.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Let me illustrate. Suppose that we are all farmers living in a certain district, and none of us has a carload. I bring in 60 bushels, another brings in 40, another 30, another 20, and so on, and we go to the elevator. The elevator man has No. 1 bin, No. 2 bin, No. 3, No. 4, etc. Our grain goes into No. 1 bin because it is No. 1; others go into No. 2, No. 3, and so on. As a result of that we have in bin No. 1 two carloads, and under the law I have a right to assign my grain to a certain gentleman, and I give an order to that effect. That gentleman owns my grain; he owns another man's grain, and so on. He has so many carloads, and the pool asks to have it shipped down to the terminal. That plan can be worked out as easily as rolling off a log, once they have the machinery to have that done.

Hon. Mr. SCHAFFNER: The honourable gentleman has made a very good exposition of his side of the case, and has given a great deal of information, and for that reason I would like to ask a certain question. I think