

and I will read it to the House as I propose to substitute it for the one in the Bill. The first subsection reads as follows in the old clause:

No person owning, managing, operating or otherwise interested in any terminal elevator shall buy or sell grain at any point in the eastern or western inspection division.

2. Subsection 1 hereof shall not apply to any person who owns, manages, operates or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator.

That is the same as it is in the old section.

(a) Which, with the approval of the Governor in Council, has been leased to the board for operation, or has been leased to any person for operation with the approval of the board, or is managed and operated by persons approved of by the board;—or

That is in substance the same as the subsection in the old clause.

(b) Which is used or operated in connection with any flour mill situate at the same terminal point as such elevator, provided, however, that such elevator shall be subject to such restrictions and regulations as are imposed by the board with the approval of the Governor in Council.

That is the same as in the old clause.

3. Subsection 1 of this section shall not apply to any person by reason only of the fact that he is an owner or holder of stock or shares in a railway company which owns or operates a terminal elevator which does not as a business buy or sell grain.

4. If the person mentioned in subsection 2 hereof owns, manages, operates, or is otherwise interested, in any terminal elevator other than a terminal elevator or elevators coming under the provisions of subsection 2 hereof, he shall not be exempt from the provisions of subsection 1 hereof.

That I think meets the suggestion which was made, and some of the objections which were made, and seems to be a reasonable arrangement as far as I can see.

Mr. McCRAVEY. Does the section, as it is now framed, meet the objections which were raised by the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) and which impressed some of us on this side of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) I do not just remember at the present time what the objection raised by the member for Portage la Prairie was, but I have had the good offices of that hon. gentleman, in conjunction with the member for Brandon, (Mr. Aikins) in framing this clause. I think I may say that it does meet his views.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we may take it for granted that subsection 4 as suggested, covers the point that was intended

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto).

to be covered by a part of the amendment that was offered by this side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. OLIVER. We may also assume that subsection 3 covers the point that was intended to be covered by a suggestion from this side of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto) That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. There still remains the fact that there is a part of subsection 1 that is the last provision in the subsection 2, that was not included in the amendment offered from this side of the House, and is considered objectionable by some hon. gentlemen around me.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). What is that?

Mr. OLIVER. The words, 'or which is managed and operated by persons approved by the board.' That is considered to be leaving a measure of responsibility on the board that is not in accordance with the intent of the section. I am quite aware that these words were introduced in the Senate last session, and are embodied in Bill 'Q' but they were added to an amendment that was placed before the Senate, and in my judgment, and in the judgment of some of our friends here, they nullify the effect of the previous part of subsection 1. We would therefore, object to the insertion of those words, and we would desire the insertion of the word 'public' in the first part of the section, so that the prohibition would apply to public as well as to terminal elevators, and the exception would not apply to persons owning and operating elevators, who might be approved by the board. I would be willing to accept my hon. friends view that the operators of public elevators in the eastern inspection division need not be included, but I would very strongly urge that public elevators in the western inspection division, should be under the same restrictions as terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). My hon. friend discussed both those points in the committee before.

Mr. OLIVER. The one in regard to public elevators, but not the other provision.

Mr. FOSTER. (North Toronto). I think we debated the question pro, and con, and I do not see that it is possible to embody the views of my hon. friend in this clause. I think that this section, taken as a whole, makes as drastic legislation as is necessary for the attainment of the object in view, and as is advisable for this parliament to enact.

Mr. KNOWLES. There are certain amendments we would like to move, but it is