

it would appeal to them, and if the standard were made uniform there would be no difficulty in working it out.

Hon. Mr. WEBSTER: I quite agree with the remarks of the honourable gentleman from Alma (Hon. Mr. Foster), speaking from the farmer's standpoint. I think this is not the time to introduce this new legislation, when we are so very short of farm help, and need greater production in the country. Coming from the agricultural district which I have had the honour of representing in the House of Commons, I know it would cause very great injustice in the country to-day if this legislation were passed. Let us think for a moment of the situation in the egg market. To-day in Canada eggs are worth somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40 cents per dozen. What about the man who has a large poultry yard of Hamburgs or bantams, and who is supplying eggs to some particular trade, such as hospitals? I have a friend in Canada who is supplying eggs to a hospital in New York, and he gets more money for them than we would pay in Canada, but he takes great care in feeding the poultry and in putting up the eggs. If I were paying for a dozen eggs, I would sooner have them weighing 1½ lb. than 1¼ lb. if they were thus produced. This legislation would tie the hands of men such as my friend, if it required that these eggs must weigh 1¼ lb.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is not in the Bill; that was amended in the Commons.

Hon. Mr. WEBSTER: The copy I have says a dozen eggs must be 1½ lb. My honourable friend also mentioned the selling of cream. To-day cream is put up at the international boundary for the New York market, in wine measure, which is smaller than Imperial measure. Are you going to put those people out of business by making them put up their cream in Imperial measure? If you are, you will tie the hands of the Canadian farmer and make it impossible for him to compete with the American farmer. My honourable friend also referred to the question of wood. What are you going to do with a fellow who meets with an accident coming into town, and has to throw off part of his load? Is he going to sell that wood by the load or by the cord? If it is to be sold by the cord, you will tie his hands also if this legislation should be put through. How is a farmer to treat his potatoes when a bag of potatoes in Quebec weighs 80 pounds, while in Ontario it weighs 90 pounds? Be-

fore passing any such drastic legislation as is proposed in this Bill, I think we had better have provincial legislation in all the different provinces requiring that potatoes be put up in 90-lb. bags. I suggest that this Bill stand over.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Coming from the same province, I heartily endorse the attitude assumed by the worthy representative of the Eastern Townships (Hon. Mr. Foster). I think he has struck a keynote that is not only popular, but just and fair. He voices here the needs of the farmers, and he has put forth a defence which I think this honourable House ought to listen to and accept. He speaks with personal knowledge. He is one of our leading agriculturists, although a lawyer in that province, and he knows full well whereof he speaks. The objections he made are not against the Bill as a whole. He has objected to certain provisions, and there are certain provisions in this Bill that are simply foolish, if not worse. For instance, he talked about the service of milk in small municipalities and villages; and let me assure him that milk sold in the large towns and cities like Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal, where there are many dairies, is put up in quart bottles, pint bottles, and half-pint bottles, the last-named being usually used for cream. These bottles cannot be stamped, cannot be branded.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: Why not?

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: I will tell you why. There is a reciprocity among all farmers and dairymen in regard to bottles. I buy a bottle of milk to-day from the Ottawa Dairy Company; to-morrow I buy from the Fairfield Dairy; when I buy my second one, I hand over the bottle of the Ottawa Dairy Company, and the other man has to take it. There is an interchange. You cannot compel the people to buy from the same person all the time. The contention of the honourable gentleman in that regard is well founded. There are other products of farm labour and other items of produce which cannot be stamped, such as maple sugar and maple syrup, as has already been mentioned. But the most serious objection that I have to this Bill is to the provision which encourages dishonesty on the part of the producer and the manufacturer. Where does the dishonesty lie in this Bill? It is in section 358, which compels honesty on the part of the manufacturer and producer when the goods manufactured and produced are consumed in Canada, but which takes the check-rein off when these goods are to be