

reasonable conclusion, and make it effective.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). But when the half loaf crumbles to nothing in your hands, it is useless. You would not get the half loaf after all.

Mr. McCRAANEY. Judging by what the minister said the other evening when we were considering this section, I was not at all sure that he considered there was a grievance. The operation of the terminal elevators appears to him to have been so satisfactory within the last year or two, at any rate he expressed his satisfaction with it, that I am not sure whether in his own mind he thought any legislation on this point necessary. However, it is in the Bill, and we must take it as it stands. I think my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) is right, that this section will be wholly ineffective to carry out the purpose for which it was intended. If the machinery of two companies may be put into operation, as the hon. member says it may be. I have no doubt that if evasion is intended, it will be accomplished by that method. We ought to decide as to whether we want an effective section or not. If we do we should pass some legislation such as my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) suggests. If we are not going to pass effective legislation, then we should drop the clause altogether, and perhaps the minister will consider again taking up that policy which was laid down by his leader before the elections, to have the terminal elevators owned by the government, which will afford an effective remedy.

Mr. TURRIFF. If we are going to do anything to remedy the evil that has existed, and certainly in the minds of the growers of the wheat a very serious evil does exist, the one way to remedy it is to prevent the men who own the terminal elevators from buying and selling any wheat in the interior elevators. Apparently that has been brought home to the minister, because he presents a clause in this Bill ostensibly for the purpose of preventing that, but when we come to look into it we find that in the judgment of a great many members of the House who have given most attention to the matter, this clause will not accomplish what the farmers of the west want and what the minister started out to give them, namely, to prevent the owners of the terminal elevators owning and operating and dealing in wheat in the interior elevators. If that is really the intention of the minister,

what possible objection can there be to making that clause mean what apparently it was intended to mean at first. Either make the clause accomplish what it is intended to accomplish, or don't try to deceive the farmers of the west by putting in a clause that apparently meets their case when it actually does not. If the government is determined not to give that protection to the wheat growers of the west; if the government is determined not to prevent the man who owns a terminal elevator from dealing in wheat in the interior, then drop the clause altogether because as it is now presented by the minister it will not prevent any single terminal elevator owner from being interested in the elevators in the interior and dealing in grain to whatever extent he likes. This is one of the difficulties the minister finds himself in on account of not carrying out the policy his leader advocated. Throughout the west during Mr. Borden's tour last summer, the right hon. gentleman promised definitely and without any reservation that if he came to power the government would own and operate the terminal elevators as a public utility. If he would carry out that policy now you would get over all the difficulties that arise in these clauses. And, while I must admit that I am not much in favour of government ownership of public utilities yet if there is one thing on the face of this earth that a government should be able to do well, it is to run terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. It can be done without any loss whatever to the government. The fees charged at the present time for putting the grain through these elevators and storing it will pay the cost of operation, and will also pay interest on the investment, if they are bought or leased on any reasonable terms, as they can be. Here is an opportunity to do what the farmers of the west want and what the leader of the government said he would give them. But, instead of doing that the Minister of Trade and Commerce brings forward a clause that ostensibly is to prevent the owners of terminal elevators from dealing in wheat in the interior, but which does not accomplish that end at all. Either make the clause mean what it purports to mean or wipe it out altogether and not try to hoodwink the farmers of the west.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The purpose of the clause, as it stands, is to, if possible, obviate the possibility of collusion between the grain man and storage man to the detriment of the public. In seeking to achieve that object, the clause goes to the extent of placing obstacles in the way of such collusion. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) in an endeavour to meet the same end, creates a condition of affairs