

or combine, which it does not appear to me to be judicious that parliament should assent to without the very fullest consideration of what seems to be the object of this legislation. If, after it has been gone into carefully, it is found that no such feature exists in this Bill, I would say let it pass, but so long as there appears on the face of it that intention it would scarcely be judicious I think for parliament to give its sanction.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I put a question about that feature of the Bill in committee and we got no very satisfactory answer. I am in sympathy with the remarks of the Minister of the Interior. There never has been a proper explanation made as to the real intention of this Bill, and it does look to me that it is quite possible that the smaller mills in Manitoba and the west might be injured. Before this Bill passes I would like an explanation as to what extent it might lead to a merger or combine in the milling industry. A great deal of capital has been expended in building smaller mills in the west of from 50 to 300 barrels capacity. We have a splendid mill in my town of about 300 barrels capacity, and through the influence of the larger mills, like the Lake of the Woods and Ogilvies, that mill, like many others throughout Manitoba, has been unable to carry on its business because of the control of prices by these larger corporations. If this Bill tends towards that object I would oppose it, and at all events it should not pass until the member who introduced it is here to explain.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to say that this Bill is the same as the last Bill, but that is not so. Clause 3 of the original Bill provides that they shall not deal in grain, and this Bill is the very reverse, for it provides they may carry on the business of purchasing, selling, storing, shipping, dealing in grain, and selling flour, and acquire by hire or otherwise, elevators and so on. That clause gives them the power to become a monopoly or a controlling element in the handling of grain to the detriment of others. I have grave doubts that we should pass such a Bill.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I did not intend to say that the powers given by this Bill were not greater than the powers in the former Bill. We were only discussing clause (d) as to the power to arbitrate, and what I said was that that provision was in the former Bill. This Bill does give wider powers than the previous Bill, and I think the Minister of the Interior has stated what these powers are. The former Bill did not give them the power to operate as traders and to buy and sell

grain. It rather constituted a combination of the smaller millers, and this was a central organization for promoting their interests. It was stated before the sub-committee that this company had been formed for the protection of the smaller millers as against the larger millers, the Lake of the Woods and others. Section 3 of the former Bill gave them power to extend, promote and improve the manufacture of flour and meal, to engage in the business of flour milling generally in Canada, in shipping and selling to foreign markets, as well as the markets of this country, of grain, flour or meal, and to assist the members of the association with regard to the matters aforesaid. There was an express denial there of the right to do a trading business. It is said that it should not constitute a trading company, or empower them to engage as a trading association in the business of buying and selling grain. The intention of this present Bill is to remove that restriction and to give them power to do not only what they have done before, but to buy and sell grain. There is an incidental power given in one of the later clauses which is common to every company: That they may take stock in other companies and other companies may take stock in this company. It was on account of this that the Minister of Agriculture made some objection when it first came before the Private Bills Committee, and it was for that reason referred to a sub-committee. The sub-committee heard Mr. Watts, the representative of the association, and it appeared that the powers sought under this Bill are similar to those which other companies of the same kind possess, and so far as the sub-committee could see the powers which were being sought were practically the same as those which had been accorded to similar companies. If it is an objection that the company should be incorporated for buying and selling grain, then that power is included in this Bill. I am not at all concerned in the Bill; I am only speaking because I was a member of the sub-committee in order to tell the House what took place before that committee. The sub-committee could not see that any harm would be done by incorporating this company to buy and sell. It is a legitimate enterprise; it is something an individual could do, and I do not see any good reason that this company should not be incorporated to do these lawful things which individuals associated together might do without an Act of parliament.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Seeing there are so many different views with regard to this measure, and that the member who is in charge of the Bill is not present, it would be wise to leave it over until the member for Brantford be here to explain.