

impossible to frame the necessary amendments at such short notice. Therefore, I would ask that the Bill again be allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to ask that the Bill again stand. We can pass the measure now, and these amendments can be moved formally just as well, and I think better on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would be quite willing to concur in the minister's suggestion if I could, but there are certain facilities granted to us in committee which we would not enjoy when the third reading of the Bill was moved, and we propose to take advantage of them. I submit that at this moment, we cannot be reasonably asked in so short a time, to study matters out now and frame the amendments which we think are necessary. If the amendments proposed by the minister had been placed in the hands of the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) a few hours ahead, it would have been different.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Although the hon. gentleman says this is new matter, it does not seem to me so. Three-quarters of it is exactly the same as was in section 123, and what remains of it is chiefly suggestions made by my hon. friend himself. I went carefully over the verbiage, and it seems all that is necessary to carry out the idea. The clause as a whole does not carry out the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite, I quite agree. But it seems to me that, when we have been nearly three weeks on this Bill, and as we are anxious to get it before the Senate as soon as possible—it will probably take some time there—the views of hon. gentlemen might well be submitted on the third reading, supported by their speeches, if they wish.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it fair to say, following what was said by my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), that, even if this were merely a question of re-adjustment of such an important clause as this, an intricate and difficult clause, had the hon. minister intended to push the discussion through to-day, it would seem only fair that hon. members on this side should have had previous notice, so that we could have framed our amendments. However, we are willing to waive that if a little delay is granted. Some other clause might be taken up, and in the meantime we will frame amendments, so that our views may be placed before the committee.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). Then, we will let that section stand. That is reasonable.

Mr. McCRAANEY. I see my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), in his place, I understand from the Minister

of Trade and Commerce that his new amendment has been submitted to my hon. friend. I was impressed with his (Mr. Meighen's), argument the other night, that neither the section in the Bill, nor the amendment proposed at that time by my hon. friend from Moosejaw would be sufficient to prevent individuals as holders of stock in companies, from being interested in the terminal elevators, and also in the country elevators. As he has been through this Bill, I would like to ask him if he is satisfied that the amendment of the minister gets over the objection that he then raised?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister has not discussed that phase with me at all. Answering the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), frankly I think this amendment does not get over the difficulty but that the objection still remains. This much can be said, that the section as is is now proposed, places obstacles in the way of evading the intention of the section. But these obstacles can be overcome.

Mr. McCRAANEY. I think the hon. gentleman is correct in his view. It is clear then, that there is only one way of getting over the difficulty which section 123 is intended to meet, and that is by carrying out the announced policy of the government to take over the terminal elevators. If the government did this terminal elevator business, there would be no danger of the same parties being interested in terminal elevators and in country elevators.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This clause stands.

On section 133—delivery of grain on return of receipt,

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto). This is a section that we discussed and decided to divide into two subsections. Subsection 1 has been passed already. It refers to the loading out at the terminals into vessels. Subsection 2 refers to loading out from the terminals into cars. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, I suppose, are fairly familiar with the situation at Fort William and Port Arthur and with the questions that arise there regarding the speedy and reasonable transport to the east after the season of navigation closes. The intention of the subsection will best be explained by reading it:

Subsection 1 shall apply to the delivery of grain to cars upon the return of any terminal warehouse receipt, provided, however, that the owner of such receipt of the terminal elevator warehouseman shall make demand in writing upon the company to place the necessary number of cars upon the elevator track. Should such demand not be complied with within the said twenty four hours, the owner or warehouseman may apply to the board—