

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: When are the Commons meeting again?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: To-night.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: No. They have adjourned until to-morrow.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I have no motion to make.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: They have adjourned until eleven to-morrow morning.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Then we may receive the Bill. I leave the motion as it is.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 12.45 p.m.

THE SENATE

Thursday, June 28, 1934.

The Senate met at 12.45 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

NATURAL PRODUCTS MARKETING BILL

SENATE AMENDMENTS NOT INSISTED UPON

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable members, a message has been received from the House of Commons, reading as follows:

Resolved that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House disagrees with their 1st and 2nd amendments to the Bill No. 51, an Act to improve the methods and practices of marketing of natural products in Canada and in export trade, and to make further provision in connection therewith, for the following reasons:

Inasmuch as wheat producers should not be treated in a different way from other producers of farm products;

Also, the Natural Products Marketing Act does not conflict with the Canada Grain Act in the case of wheat, nor in the case of coarse grains which are included in the Act, and to which no exception has been taken.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Honourable senators, as stated in the message which has just been read, the House of Commons has disagreed with the amendments moved by the honourable gentleman from Provencher (Hon. Mr. Molloy) and carried in this House on division. At the time the amendments were moved, while recognizing that much could be said in support of them, I asked the House to decline them, and, largely for the first reason set out in the memorandum to which we have just listened—namely, that it is better to have all natural products

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

treated alike—to accept the Bill without any change. Possibly there is some force in the second reason given by the Commons, though I do not attach to it the same importance as that House apparently considered it to have. The Senate felt that this measure would virtually give the Government power to repeal the Grain Act, but the message intimates that the inclusion of wheat under the new legislation would not prevent the machinery of the Grain Act from still being used.

I move that the Senate do not insist upon its amendments, but accede to the position that has been taken by the other House. I hope this motion will be agreed to, for I fear that otherwise a very important measure would be imperilled.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: On my own part—for I have not consulted my colleagues—I shall not vote that the Senate insist upon its amendments. But it strikes me that with all the machinery now available for the marketing of grain there will be a tendency to help wheat producers to form a pool, and an attempt to coerce some producers into joining it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there will be any disposition to coerce wheat producers. I do not know what would be my state of mind if any such disposition were in evidence.

The motion was agreed to.

EXCISE BILL

INSISTENCE UPON SENATE AMENDMENTS

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable senators, a message has been received from the House of Commons, reading as follows:

Resolved that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House disagrees to their amendments to Bill 89, an Act to amend and consolidate the Excise Act, for the following reason:

Namely, that the said amendments do not fully assure protection to the revenues of the Crown.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am in a very different state of mind with respect to this message. Needless to say, considerable discussion has taken place since the amendments were inserted. One honourable member of this House took the trouble to go over the American legislation, from which our Act appears to be almost verbally derived, and he found that the United States does not venture to go so far as our department has for years been going, namely to the extent of confiscating the property of entirely innocent, law-abiding citizens on the ground that such