

every piece of important legislation in all its ramifications. Without denying that this bill is introduced very late in the session, my inadequate explanation of its contents may be taken to confirm what I have repeatedly said about the burdens which are cast upon one man in this chamber.

If the house should adopt the amendment of my honourable friend, it will thereby preclude itself from obtaining the full information which I believe would be forthcoming in committee. It is the established practice of this assembly to obtain through its standing committees the details of proposed legislation, and I suggest that the practice should not be departed from on this occasion. I might also point out that the mover of the amendment remarked that he had no particular objection to the first part of the bill, which prescribes standards for butter; his main objection was to the contents of section 6.

Hon. Mr. Euler: That contains, to my mind, the principle of the bill, which is what we discuss on second reading.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: It is quite within the province of my honourable friend or of any other honourable senator to move an amendment after the bill has received second reading.

The existing practices in this house will continue, and I make no undertaking that I shall ever be in a position to give detailed information about legislation which originates in the other house. It simply cannot be done. I have availed myself of the experience of honourable senators in this chamber, but one cannot expect them to have detailed information on House of Commons bills, many of which have wide ramifications and involve deep constitutional questions. I think it would be unwise to preclude honourable members from the benefit of receiving detailed information in committee in regard to bills brought before them. In committee the members can deal with legislation as they see fit.

Hon. John T. Haig: Honourable senators, my purpose in rising is to offer the house a suggestion. I am disturbed about the idea of voting against any bill on second reading. I entirely agree with what has just been said by the leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson). If I were in his position I would feel exactly as he does.

Now, I object to clause 6 of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Hugessen: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Let me make myself clear. I have always voted in this house against the lifting of the ban on the manufacture

and sale of oleomargarine. I spoke strongly against this when the issue first came before the Senate, and I need not speak about it again because my views are well known here.

Let me say quite candidly that I am not at all interested in this bill as it affects oleomargarine. I am disturbed, however, about section 6. In that I agree with the honourable member from Cariboo (Hon. Mr. Turgeon). This section does not go all the way to the principle underlying the bill. If food substitutes are being put on the market in this country then, of course, our Food and Drugs Act could be amended to cover that situation completely.

Hon. Mr. King: If the substitutes are injurious.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Yes. I object to section 6 of the bill for the reasons set forth by the honourable senator from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Vien). I do not think the British North America Act ever contemplated the prohibition of trade between our provinces.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Such a thing would be disastrous to our country. I am not going to say whether a Liberal or a Conservative policy is involved here, because that is something which does not "cut much ice" in the Senate. What I want to do is to suggest to the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) that he withdraw his proposal of a six-months' hoist.

It may be said that when we give a bill second reading we are in effect voting for the principle of it. Well, there have been many times when I have not blocked a bill on second reading, but have later had it amended in committee so that it did not look like the same bill at all. I agree with the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) that this is the proper stage at which to discuss the principle of this bill, but I would suggest that we give it second reading now and move to refer it to committee. Then the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler), seconded by the honourable senator from Leeds (Hon. Mr. Hardy), could move that the committee be instructed to strike out section 6 of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: Why not strike out section 5 of the bill as well?

Hon. Mr. Haig: Section 5 is not quite the same.

Hon. Mr. Vien: Section 3 is the same too.

Hon. Mr. Haig: The vital section is section 6.

Hon. Mr. Vien: Sections 3 and 5 are just as bad.