

Hon. Mr. Euler: For some twenty-five years now we have operated pretty well under the Dairy Industry Act, even though we have not always agreed with all its sections, particularly the one dealing with oleomargarine. Surely there is not going to be any great harm done to the interests of the public if we let the present Dairy Industry Act continue to operate until parliament meets again in the fall. I suggest to the leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) that he consider dropping the bill now.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Perhaps everyone will not admit it, but I think it is clear that this is an imperfect and ill-conceived bill. In fact, it was really not considered at all in the House of Commons, and it reached us only three days ago. What possible harm can come to the Canadian people if this bill is dropped now, on the understanding that when parliament meets again three months hence the government will bring down a bill which will be well considered, and which, if passed, will be free of the defects contained in the present bill. I most earnestly commend this suggestion to the leader of the government.

Some Hon. Senators: Question.

The amendment of Hon. Mr. Euler was negatived on the following division:

CONTENTS

Honourable Senators

Bishop	McGuire
Davis	McLean
Euler	Petten
Fallis	Pratt
King	Quinton
Lacasse	Reid
Lambert	Roebuck—15.
Marcotte	

NON-CONTENTS

Honourable Senators

Beaubien	Hurtubise
Bouffard	Isnor
Comeau	MacKinnon
Duffus	McDonald
Dupuis	Robertson
Farquhar	Stevenson
Godbout	Taylor
Golding	Turgeon
Gouin	Vaillancourt
Hawkins	Veniot—21.
Howard	

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, the question is now on the motion of the Honourable Senator Robertson that this bill be now read a second time. Is it your pleasure to carry the motion?

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Before the question is decided, I should like to say that I have followed the debate on this matter with the greatest interest. I have been impressed by

the fair presentation of arguments by honourable members, but I am bound to say that I was a little disappointed that the mover of the amendment (Hon. Mr. Euler) seemed to go out of his way to question the motives and good intentions of the Minister of Agriculture. It is the duty and responsibility of that minister to advance whatever measures he considers to be in the interests of agriculture, and I think it fair to assert that he has served the people of this country to a higher degree than any of his predecessors in office.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: I regret that my honourable friend from Waterloo should have found it necessary to cast these general aspersions on the Minister, and I do not think that by so doing he added to the excellent arguments he previously advanced.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Honourable senators, I claim the privilege of denying unreservedly that I questioned the motives of the Minister of Agriculture. What I said was that I did not agree with most of his policies.

Hon. Mr. Marcotte: I wish to emphasize what the honourable leader (Hon. Mr. Robertson) has said about the Minister of Agriculture. I come from the same province as the minister, and although we have been bitter political opponents he is a very dear friend of mine. I admire him and I know his love for agriculture. I know what he wishes to do, but it has no bearing on the principle involved in this bill. I hope the government will do in this case what it has done in other cases and refer the principle of this bill to the Supreme Court of Canada for a ruling.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time, on division.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Honourable senators, I move that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Natural Resources. It has been suggested to me that this bill should properly be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I would point out, however, that I had already called a meeting of the Committee on Natural Resources in the expectation that the bill receive second reading. Nevertheless, I have no intention of going against the wishes of the house in this matter.

Hon. Mr. Lambert: Honourable senators, I was the person who made this suggestion to the leader. When the bill was introduced several days ago the leader said, I believe, that if it received second reading he would