

ing the clause of 1912, we are likely to hear a complaint similar to that which was raised in England with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Is it advisable to do that? As to the effect of the law prior to 1925, each side seems to be equally positive in its contention. So far as I am concerned, I have a clear opinion on the point, but I am not called upon to decide between the parties or even to state what my opinion is. Our duty, I think, is to say: "You both declare that you were protected by the Act of 1912. Well, we will put you under that Act and you will then have no reason to complain." If we do otherwise we shall be accused either of interfering with vested rights and jeopardizing the large amount of capital invested, or of putting one of the parties at the mercy of the other.

As to the effect of the present Bill, I think no one who has studied it and followed the discussion can deny that the passing of this measure would place the grain elevator company entirely at the mercy of the pool. I am in perfect sympathy with the pool organization. I think they are rendering service to the farmers and protecting them, and I wish them success, but I am not disposed to do any injustice to their competitors. I think that what we as honest men should do would be to adopt the suggestion made by the honourable member from Saltcoats yesterday, and that is to repeal the Act of 1925 and give the pool organization the privilege of purchasing, if they choose, one or more elevators at any point, by arbitration. I think that would be doing justice to both parties and it is the course which should be adopted by this honourable House.

Will not the honourable gentleman from Saltcoats move a sub-amendment to that effect, which I would gladly second?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Honourable gentlemen, I have no amendment prepared. I merely suggested during the course of my remarks what I thought were the only two possible courses. Apparently the honourable gentleman from De Salaberry suggests another course, and that is that the two suggestions that I have made should be combined; in other words, that clause 1 of the Bill should be struck out, and that we should substitute for it a clause repealing the 1925 provision on the same matter and restoring the clause in the Act of 1912—

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Reviving it.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: — and add to that the right of the pool to purchase elevators, as has been suggested by the honourable member for Regina (Hon. Mr. Laird).

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: That is it.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That would suit me, and I am prepared to vote for it. I have not the amendment prepared—

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: The motion is easy to make. The honourable gentleman has only to dictate it.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I am not quite sure of that. I understand that we cannot simply re-enact the 1912 section, because an amendment passed last year made some distinction between public terminal elevators and private terminal elevators. Just what that amendment is and what changes should be made in the law of 1912 I cannot say off-hand. It would be necessary to look up the law. If the Committee adjourned for fifteen minutes we might frame an amendment, but I would not like to do it off-hand.

Hon. Mr. McLENNAN: Let us accept the principle of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: It has been done.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: In a discussion I had with Mr. Pitblado before the dinner hour, he told me that some slight amendment to the law of 1912 would be necessary on account of a change made in the Grain Act at the time of the general revision last year. I think the chief point in connection with that is that last year, for the first time, a distinction was drawn between what are called public terminal elevators and private terminal elevators, the private terminal being a mixing house, a hospital elevator or something of that kind. That distinction would have to be taken care of in any new amendment that is made.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: Honourable gentlemen, I am not going to answer any of the arguments that have been advanced, though I might say something in reply; but I want to make an explanation. I am placed in a very embarrassing position. I introduced this Bill at the instance of its proponent in the other House, Mr. Campbell. He has gone home and I am unable to consult him.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Bring him back.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: With the exception of Mr. Hoey, whose name has been mentioned, the representatives of the pool have gone home. If I had introduced the Bill myself and had been receiving instructions direct from those who desire its passage, I would not hesitate to act, for I never have much hesitation in acting when I have made up my mind, mistaken though I may be. From what I gathered in a conversation with