

That is a dandy piece of legislation to use in a case of a strike on our lakes.

—vehicle—

You must not interfere with my motor car. That is a prohibited act, and I may send you to jail for ten years.

—aircraft, machinery, apparatus or other thing...

Any plant would qualify under this. It would cover any act or omission that impairs the efficiency or impedes the working of any plant in any town, city, or elsewhere.

The section goes on:

(b) causes property, by whatsoever it may be owned—

That would include my automobile.

—to be lost, damaged or destroyed.

—is liable to imprisonment for ten years.

That is new legislation which is terrible and drastic, and it has not been given any real consideration whatsoever. I warrant that it has not been approved by the Attorneys-General of the provinces. I warrant that it has never been laid before the Law Society for the consideration of informed men. It has been dreamed up in the back offices of our Justice Department by young men hired to do this kind of work. We, of course, shall pass it. I know that what I am saying is futile because the bill is well on its way to being passed, but I want to put myself on record as being opposed to this kind of drastic, reckless, ill-thought-out legislation of a prohibitory and dominating character.

If anybody wants an illustration of what has happened to this Act let him observe what I have in my hand. This is a copy of the bill that came from the House of Commons. One whole page has been eliminated. I do not know why. Here is another section which has been eliminated. When we were considering this bill in our committee on Banking and Commerce the officials of the department had half a dozen amendments which they asked us to put into the bill, which of course we did. It just illustrates the lack of care with which this work has been done. It has been carried out either too rapidly or with too much secrecy; it has had too little publicity and it has come to us far too late in the session to be given real consideration. Well, go ahead and pass it!

Hon. Mr. Marcotte: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate until later in the day.

The motion was agreed to, and the debate was adjourned.

CANADA DAIRY PRODUCTS BILL

SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from yesterday the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Robertson for the second reading of Bill 403, an Act to establish national standards

for dairy products and to regulate inter-provincial and international trade in dairy products, and the motion in amendment of Hon. Mr. Euler,—That the said bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months.

Hon. Thomas Reid: Honourable senators, in rising to take part in this debate I do so as one who from a practical standpoint is conversant with the trials and tribulations of farmers—I am still a member of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association. I am not unmindful of the plight of farmers in many instances. I know of their hard work and long hours, and I am sure that many union workers in our cities would never consent to work so long and so hard as our farmers do. However, it is not altogether reasonable to contrast farm work with work in a city, for, as those of us who have lived and worked on farms know, farming is a way of life which has compensations that are not obtainable by urban dwellers.

I want to join in a protest which has been voiced by other members against legislative measures—especially measures like this and the Criminal Code Bill—being sent over to the Senate in the dying days of the session.

When I was appointed a senator and came here from the House of Commons, I heard it stated on numerous occasions that it was the duty and the responsibility of the Senate to review hasty legislation—to give a second look at it, so to speak. But I say without fear of successful contradiction that the bill we are about to read the second time and the one that we were discussing previously, the Criminal Code Bill, have not been given a second look or scarcely a glance by many members of this chamber.

Hon. Mr. Duffus: What about the Judges Bill?

Hon. Mr. Reid: I was not present when the Judges Bill was passed, but if I had been here I would have opposed it. I hope you opposed it, although I would be surprised if you did. Perhaps that will hold you for a while. If it does not, I will elaborate a bit.

Ever since 1922, when I was first elected to public office, I have taken the stand that it was my duty while in office to represent the people. I know that some persons do not agree with that principle. I have always taken the matter seriously; and I have always been, as I am today, as good a Liberal as any other senator or any member of the House of Commons.

Now I come to the bill. I disagree, of course, with the suggestion made by the honourable senator from St. Jean Baptiste (Hon. Mr. Beaubien).