

243 also says that every person guilty of an infraction of this Act is liable to a penalty. I think these two clauses fairly cover my hon. friend's question. My point is that the minister's suggested legislation is of the very kind and the very principle on which my amendment is based, except that my amendment goes to a logical conclusion, and makes it effective.

Mr. MACLEAN. (South York) Would not state ownership of the terminal elevator make evasion impossible?

Mr. THOMSON. Qu'Appelle. Sure.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Then if the farmers are suffering under these disabilities, should not that be the underlying principle of this Bill?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). We are quite satisfied to do that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member is surely hardly serious in asking the House to enact legislation that would have that effect. It would throw on the officers enforcing this law a burden greater than the whole burden of the Criminal Code in Canada to-day. How could they go over the 7,000,000 people in Canada, and find out if any one of them has a share in each of two companies? If John Brown wished to have stock in two companies he could have his stock in one in his own name, and in the other in his wife's name, and if he had not enough wives, he could have it in the name of any other citizen of Canada.

Mr. KNOWLES. Would that argument not apply as well to the legislation proposed by the minister?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The legislation of the minister, if it could be carried into effect, would be reasonably useful. I do not believe that it can be carried into effect.

Mr. KNOWLES. The wife business would work just as well in what the minister suggests as in my amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Certainly, but the burden of enforcing it would not be so great. The amendment is absurd on its face, because there would be nothing in the way of an intent to violate the provisions of this law in a man having a share in each of two companies. To attempt to enforce such a regulation as the hon. gentleman has proposed would be too absurd for consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). The argument of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), is against both of these proposals. He has not confidence in either. The only way to effectually

Mr. KNOWLES

stop this evil is by complete government control of the terminal elevators.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). One step at a time.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle). I agree with what the last speaker has said in regard to public ownership, provided it is applied to all terminal elevators. Then we would not need this section. The only reason we need it now is that we are not sure we are to have public ownership or operation of all terminal elevators. I do not think the hon. member for Portage la Prairie has answered the objection to his argument raised by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles). There would be no more difficulty in enforcing the hon. member's amendment than the section as proposed by the minister. If the principle laid down in the section is correct, then the amendment of my hon. friend is only bringing that principle to its legitimate conclusion, and unless you adopt some such amendment you might as well abandon the section. I cannot understand the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) being prepared to vote against the amendment suggested, and in favour of the section as proposed by the minister.

As to the point just raised that the suggested amendment would not be effective, I have tried to follow my hon. friend, but I must say I cannot see its force. I can hardly fancy him raising such an argument in court. Take the illustration he gives. A, B, and C are interested in a terminal elevator, and also in the purchasing business. Suppose that A, B and C are interested in the Saskatchewan Grain Company, buying in the interior, and in the Fort William Terminal Elevator Company. It is quite true that you would not be able to prosecute the Saskatchewan Grain Company under this, but why can you not prosecute A, B, and C who may be interested in both companies. They could be prosecuted, they come within the section as it is proposed to be amended.

As to the legislation being unusual, I think the legislation proposed by the minister is unusual, but I do not think that should condemn it. Why condemn legislation because it is unusual? Are we to be continually trailing behind other people? Have we not as much right to originate legislation as any one? In regard to the grain trade, I think we are best qualified and in the best position on earth to introduce new legislation. If my hon. friend is worrying about legacies I would have no objection to a clause excepting the recipient of a legacy of stock until he has had time to dispose of it. That is not a serious matter. I would like to see the whole section dropped as utterly useless or else to follow it to its legitimate and