

that is worse than if we never attempted to remove the difficulty at all, because it places on the statutes, laws that bring about an absurdity. I must say that for my own part I very largely agree with the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), and with other hon. gentlemen who have stated that if we are to obtain this object in its entirety the only way is by public ownership of the elevators. I am not so recent a convert to that principle as are hon. gentlemen opposite. I can remember when I urged this principle in this House and met with the determined antagonism of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), and of many others of those gentlemen opposite, antagonism not only by their speeches but by their solid party vote. No one welcomes more than I do the step taken by the government in the matter; they have adopted the principle of government ownership; they have conceived it their duty to the people of Canada to move not hurriedly, but slowly in the matter, and as they go step by step in the principle of government ownership of elevators they learn as they go, and the advantage will accrue to the people of Canada. I believe that a great part of the object to be served by this clause can also be served by forcing the railway companies so far as possible to operate their own elevators, and I earnestly hope that the government will see its way to adopt that principle, and to push to the utmost extent it can, the necessity of these railway companies operating their own elevators instead of leasing them for operation.

But that means the adoption of the principle of government ownership, which they have done, and I am glad to see that they have done it, and, by forcing the railway companies to operate their own elevators, they will meet to a large extent, the object in view, under clause 123; and Sir, I will welcome, as everybody on this side of the House will welcome, the newly-found allegiance of hon. gentlemen opposite, now that they know what the sentiment of western Canada is, in this regard. I will welcome their assistance, and I only regret that we had not the eloquent voice of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) in the last parliament, because I can see, from the manly stand that he has taken here, that he would not have yielded to the party whip in this House, session after session, but would have been one of the bolters, and would have gone the whole road that was so often threatened to be gone, by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I do not wish to divert the debate from where it is at the present moment; but something of the widest national importance has come

Mr. MEIGHEN.

out in this debate. We have laws in this country creating corporations, and these laws are constantly resorted to for the purpose of evading the general law for the protection of the public welfare of this country. We are bound to continue the incorporation of companies by general Act or by special Act, but some day soon we must provide a general law that when an incorporation is used for the purpose of evading a law which is intended to protect the public welfare, or for the purpose of getting ahead of the public; the company doing so, will lose its charter. We shall have to deal with that question at an early day, both from a federal and a provincial point of view.

Mr. BURNHAM. How would the hon. member deal with that question?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). If a number of men, in order to evade the public law, sought incorporation, when that fact was proved the Act of incorporation would be forfeited.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 123, now under discussion, was made a part of Bill (Q) of the Senate last session, for the purpose of separating absolutely the business of the storage of grain in terminal elevators from the business of buying grain at country points. The section was framed for this purpose, and the reason was, that it was admitted in the evidence that had been given, that there was no possibility of a government inspection of terminal elevators while they were in the hands of grain dealers, that would effectively prevent the mixing of grades. In the expectation that some provision would be made that would have this effect, section 123 as it was first introduced was framed. What my hon. friend from South York has said is absolutely true. It was recognized by the government at the time that section was framed that the condition which was said to exist must be remedied. It was expected that it could be remedied by a provision such as is contained in this section; but it was thoroughly understood that section 13 of this Bill, which was sections 16 and 17 of Bill Q, was the evident intent of the then government in that matter. The intent is clearly set out in these two sections, the one being party to the other. So that a certain purpose was intended to be achieved. If it could be achieved under section 123, well and good. There was less disturbance of then existing trade conditions than would occur if advantage were taken of the provisions of section 13. But if on experiment it was found that the provisions of section 123 were not sufficient, then the alternative was already embodied in the Act of government operation of terminal elevators. When the Bill came to the Commons, it was intended that section 123, as it is repeated in the Bill now before the