

cause they promised that if the Conservative party got into power, a law should be passed to legalize the marriages—the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) can tell me the wording of it.

Mr. LENNOX. Who made the promise?

Mr. KNOWLES. The people of Ontario were promised that if they would vote for these hon. gentlemen—

Mr. LENNOX. Where was the promise made?

Mr. KNOWLES—they would insist on there being put through parliament at once an Act legalizing marriages in the province of Quebec. And when it came to voting on the matter, there were five—the famous five, the faltering but faithful five—who voted for it, and the rest voted to hoist the thing over to the old country. A second illustration is the Farmers' Bank; some promised the shareholders of the Farmers' Bank that they would get their money back for them. Vote for us, said the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), and our government when it comes into power will give you poor farmers back the money that these thieves took from you. Is that promise being carried out? Take another: The double play on the navy question. The members on the other side from the province of Quebec told the people: Vote for us and at the very first session the Navy Bill will be repealed and this whole question settled forever. And we find that, only yesterday, in another place, the leader on the government side there announced that the matter would not be touched this year, and the whole Conservative party in that House, including a minister of the Crown, voted against the repeal of this Navy Act which some gentlemen supporting the government promised would be repealed this session if they came into power, and if not so repealed these gentlemen stated they would resign, but there is no repeal and the hon. members from Quebec remain with us. And we find this party that has come into power on the strength of promises with regard to Ne Temere, the navy, the Farmers' Bank—

Mr. LEMIEUX. The school question.

Mr. KNOWLES—yes, and the school question, and the control and operation of terminal elevators, is not carrying out one of these plagues. They have got the votes, they have fooled the people. What more care they? There is but one exception to their complete failure to carry out their promises. I see the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), is here and in good humour. He has carried out one promise that was made. But the promise was not

Mr. KNOWLES.

made to the common people. This was not a promise to the thousands of Protestants in all the Ontario ridings like that other promise, that if they would put out of power the leader of the late government Ontario would have such an ascendancy that the marriage question would be dealt with in a way to please them. It was not a promise made to the poor habitant of Quebec like the one that the Navy Act should be repealed. It was not a promise such as that made to the poor farmer of the northwest, that there should be government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, nor is it their promise to the trusting farmers with worthless bank stock in his hands. No, this was a promise made to their masters, the manufacturers, that if the party now in power should succeed a Tariff Commission would be established. That is the one and only promise that they have kept.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have another amendment which I will explain before I read it, so that hon. members may understand it better. The main section—an amended section—which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has placed in your hands, Mr. Chairman, provides that 'subsection 1 of this section shall not apply to any person who owns, manages, operates or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator' which has been leased to the board or with the approval of the board. I think that is too wide. I spoke on this subject the other day, and need not repeat my points. I hold that only the person who owns the elevator, but has divested himself from control and operation, should be protected. The section makes it apply as well to one who manages or operates or is otherwise interested in the terminal elevator thus leased. This defeats the principle of the section itself, and is merely anomalous. If a man owns an elevator and operates it, as a man who prefers straight-forward dealing may well be inclined to do, he is forbidden by this section to buy or sell grain. But if he leases that elevator from its owner, then he can buy and sell grain. Surely, that was not the purpose of the section. We do not want to put the lessee on a better basis than the owning proprietor; so I propose to amend that by restricting it to the person who owns the elevator. Therefore, I propose that section 123 be amended by striking out the words:

Manages, purchases or is otherwise interested in any terminal elevator.

And substituting therefor:

Or is in any way interested in the ownership of any terminal elevator.

Amendment negatived on division.