

House, should be amended so as to make it conform more nearly to the principle that it was intended to express. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie and his colleagues from the west will remember very distinctly that they took advantage of the conditions that existed at that time to prevent the Bill from either being amended or being passed in its unamended form.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the government move the amendments which the hon. gentleman speaks of in the House?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say the government did.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did any one?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then how do we know anything about them?

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. member will do me the courtesy of listening to what I say, he will know.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman is telling this House that it was intended to make the amendment. Where was the intention manifested?

Mr. OLIVER. I am stating a certain intent, and I expect the hon. gentleman to take my word. This section of the Bill comes before this House now in exactly the same form as it came in the previous session, and the House has to face the position now as it faced it then; and it is for those hon. members who at that time declared their opposition to the Bill, because they said that it did not provide for government ownership of elevators, either to secure the amendment of that section so that it will be effective or to declare here and now for government ownership of terminal elevators.

There is a purpose to be served which every member from the west is well aware of, and I am sure other members of the House as well are aware of. It makes no difference whether that purpose can be served under the principles laid down, or proposed to be laid down, in this section or not. If it cannot be served under the principles laid down, or proposed to be laid down, in this section—and my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) says it cannot—then it is for him, if he supports government ownership, to get up in this House and say so and back his statement with his vote.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has stated what he meant to do, but he knows, and every member of the House who was here on the 19th of May last year knows, it would have been absolutely impossible to have carried out his intentions.

Mr. LANCASTER. He never manifested the intention.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have not Bill Q. here, but it contained, I think, the same number of clauses that are to be found in the present measure. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) knows very well whether he acted purposely or not—I am not aware as to that—but this Bill was brought down on the 19th of May, the day upon which this House adjourned, and yet he tells us he expected this Bill, the criticism of which on his part at least a week has taken, to pass.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The ex-Minister of the Interior would lead us to believe that his intention was to have the Bill properly criticised and then placed upon the statute books of the country so that a grain commission, or any other body of men, could work intelligently under it, all in one day. Certainly we objected to putting the Bill through in one day because it was an absolutely impossible thing to do, a fact which he certainly knew himself. The hon. gentleman therefore should not be so sensitive when his intentions, as he expressed them, are not taken at their full value.

Mr. KNOWLES. The debate has had reference to the question as to the stand of members on both sides of the House on the matter of public ownership of terminal elevators. As I take it our stand is not so much that we are committed at this moment to the theory, or the principle, of government control and operation of government elevators, as that we are committed to the theory and principle that when a gentleman advocates a certain measure before the people of Canada for their support, and makes solemn promises as did the Prime Minister, he should carry those promises into effect.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When did you start to do that?

Mr. BLAIN. What about free trade?

Mr. KNOWLES. When did we start?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. Hon. gentlemen opposite have thrown the taunt across the floor of the House that we did not lower the tariff. The tariff was lowered degree by degree, and a good, substantial reduction in the duties was made. That taunt is used only for political effect by hon. gentlemen opposite, including the Conservative member from the prairie provinces.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Did my hon. friend vote for the reduction of the tariff on agricultural implements?