

sold in the United States or other foreign countries. If that is not an incitement to dishonesty, I do not know what it is. Why make a distinction for the benefit of the home consumer, and not for the benefit of the foreign consumer? Do you imagine for one moment that this country depends upon home consumption to increase its revenue and wealth? No. We have scarcely 7,000,000 of a population in Canada, and there are sufficient goods produced from the soil, the forests, the mines and the sea not only for a population of 7,000,000, but for a population of 27,000,000. What are we doing to-day? We are feeding the millions on the other side of the sea during this cruel war. The Government has been badly advised in accepting this clause, which says that you must be honest in dealing with home consumers, but you may do as you please with the foreign consumer. I hope the House will seize the point, weigh it, and ask if it is to the honour and credit of Canada that such legislation should be passed. How can a foreign consumer take our goods when he knows that by statutory law passed in this Parliament frauds can be perpetrated upon him, while the home consumer is protected? Are we going to increase our export trade by legislation of that kind? I hold that we are not, that this clause is discreditable, and that this honourable House ought not to be a party to passing it.

These are a few of the objections to this Bill. As the honourable senator from Wentworth (Hon. Mr. Smith), who spoke so well, said, there are many good points to this Bill, but there are many wrong ones, and the Bill ought not to pass to-day. It should be held over, and some one who has common sense and common fair play in his nature should draft a Bill.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: You should do it yourself.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: I would be a pretty good hand at it. You would get fair play and honesty.

Like many of my honourable friends on the other side, I think the leader of the Government would be doing well if he withdrew the Bill. It would be no defeat of the Government; it would show wisdom in acknowledging that advice well directed should be heeded. Unfortunately, as I have already pointed out in this honourable House, once a Bill has received the brand and stamp of ministerial sanction it must not be touched, it must not be amended, otherwise you will be voting against the

Hon. Mr. CLORAN.

Government. That is not a proper attitude for intelligent legislators to assume. The Government brings down this measure and should leave it absolutely in the hands of the representatives of the people to give their views, and should accept them when they are proper. That is true not only of this measure, but of all measures. That is my idea of government. There must be some one to direct; but the directors, as well as the team that he is driving, should heed the crack of the whip.

Under the circumstances I am pleased to endorse the action of the honourable member from Alma (Hon. Mr. Foster), in requesting the Government to hold up this Bill and give us a clearer and more adequate measure.

Hon. Mr. FOSTER: Honourable gentlemen, I am encouraged by the interest which has been taken in this discussion to move that the committee rise. I do this not only because I think that justice will be done to the people immediately interested, but for the additional reason that it may convince the honourable gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Cloran) that the Senate of Canada is not governed by the powers which he suggests.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: We have lately been hearing a great deal of the United States. Whenever a statesman in the United States brings a Bill before Congress, he gives it his name—for instance, the McKinley Bill, the Dingley Bill, etc. Instead of this Bill being stamped No. 19, why should it not be called "the Foster Bill," after the gentleman who has hatched it? But before you put it in the statute book, label it "premature."

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: "Still-born."

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: After listening to the speeches that have been made, I do not know whether there is any room to say anything on behalf of the consumer. I have listened to the arguments of honourable gentlemen regarding the difficulty of stamping goods. One of the articles dwelt upon is milk—the importance of regulating the sale of milk without entailing great hardship upon the farmer or the dairyman. Every one who handles these bottles knows that they can be very easily marked on the stopper; in fact, many of the dairymen mark them in that way to-day—a pint, a half-pint, or a quart; so there is no hardship in stamping a bottle of milk, and I contend that there is no hardship in stamping a great many other articles.