

which is before us, in which great interests are involved—interests which have been and are now in conflict with each other and which, if they remain in conflict, will prove an element not for the benefit of the West or the benefit of Canada as a whole. I do not want to go into the different points to be considered, but if there can be a reasonable arrangement made in this Committee, issuing in legislation which will provide that the opposing interests large and important as they are, can be brought to work in harmony rather than in opposition to each other, the ultimate object which we have in view might be attained in that way. This would be a very laudable thing for the Senate to carry out. We had that opinion last night, and I think very many of us have it this morning.

I quite recognize that the position of the mover of this Bill is a rather trying one. He undertook, after what passed here yesterday, to get into communication as far as he could with authoritative parties on the pool side of the arrangement, or, shall we say, with those who favoured this Bill as it is, in order that he might be guided as to what he should do and advise the Senate to do. I think the step that he has taken was a wise one; but such communications do not issue in results in an hour or two, and my honourable friend is without any advice from the parties to whom he appealed. Now, if we were sincere in our ideal last night, which was to get conclusions on the basis of a fair agreement between the interests, I think we ought to wait a few hours to know what will come as the results of the inquiry of my honourable friend, then when we meet in the afternoon we shall have such information as my honourable friend may have gained. It may be that there cannot be any arrangement between the two interests, either promised or actually carried out, but on the other hand there may be, and we would be perfectly justified in taking some hours to give an opportunity for such agreement rather than proceeding at once.

So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that I am prepared to vote on the first clause of the Bill, on the second clause, and also on the amendments. I am not shirking any vote. I am not unwilling to let everybody know just where I stand on this matter, and when the time comes I shall be able to say just exactly why I take the course I do. When my honourable friend said in his telegram that there was considerable opposition to this Bill he did not go far enough, in my opinion; he might have said

that there was very considerable opposition to it. He certainly stated the fact in a very mild manner.

That is all that I wish to say just at present, but these considerations lead me to think that the best way for us to do is to adjourn until say 3 o'clock, and come back and see what the situation is at that time; then, if necessary go to it, and vote; and if my honourable friend wants to challenge a vote on the principle of this Bill, clause 1, clause 2, and the amendments, I am prepared to assist him in that.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I referred to that because the principle of the Bill was not voted upon on the second reading.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: But how can you get at the principle and avoid the amendments? When the adoption of the first section is moved, you have one, two, three, or four amendments. It is impossible for a member to say beforehand that he will vote yes or no on the Bill. If you challenge a vote, and it is in the negative, your Bill is dead, whereas the people interested might have had something very beneficial to them if they could have the Bill as proposed to be amended.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Of course I see the difficulty.

Hon. Mr. ROSS: Well, you have got to or two words about the delay. I was one of those who asked for the adjournment of the Committee on Banking and Commerce in order to hear the Board of Grain Commissioners. If there is any criticism of that, I think any member who heard the evidence when the Commissioners appeared before us and gave testimony will say that the evidence we got from them is full justification for asking for that adjournment. Their evidence made the whole matter much clearer, and was very satisfactory to me. I stated at the Committee that it was not so much in regard to the first clause of the Bill that I wanted to hear the Grain Commissioners, but rather as to section 2, making the town of Moose Jaw an order point. I admit that I, among others, asked for that adjournment, but I am glad I did so, and I have no apology to make to anybody.

In regard to the Bill itself, since it came into this House I have given more attention to it than I have done to any other Bill that has been before us this Session. Indeed, there have been very few Bills in this House since I have been a member of it to which I have given as much attention. There are more reasons than one for that. The subject