

from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) said, the bill was very briefly discussed in another place. I read the debate, which occupied only a column and a half of *Hansard*. The honourable senator from Provencher (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) asks us to give the bill second reading so that it can go to committee. My understanding is that parliament will adjourn tomorrow until October. What possibility is there of having the bill go to committee and be reported, or dealt with, in this short period of time?

It is with great pleasure that I second the amendment of the honourable senator from Waterloo.

**Hon. J. G. Turgeon:** Honourable senators, until the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) moved his amendment, I had not intended to speak on the bill. On two occasions I have voted against motions relating to oleomargarine moved by the honourable senator. I am largely in agreement with the statements he made respecting section 6 of the bill, and I am prepared to vote against that section, but I cannot support the proposal of a six months' hoist, for that would prevent honourable senators from studying the whole question in committee.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** Section 6 embodies the principle of the bill, and it is the principle of the bill which will be endorsed if the house gives it second reading.

**Hon. Mr. Turgeon:** I differ slightly from my honourable colleague. Section 6 embodies a certain principle, but I do not think it can be correctly described as "the principle of the bill". In the explanatory note it is stated that the bill will replace the Dairy Industry Act, except Part III thereof, which will be continued as The Milk Test Act. Were we to give the bill the six months' hoist we would defeat the effort not only of the government but of the House of Commons to bring in legislation which is designed largely to replace the Dairy Industry Act, and we would do so merely because one clause contains a certain principle with which many of us do not agree. As section 6 stands, I would feel obliged to vote against it if the matter came to a vote; but I also feel obliged to vote against the amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Vien:** Will the honourable senator from Cariboo (Hon. Mr. Turgeon) allow me a question? Does he believe that it is possible at this stage of the session for the Senate to carefully consider all the aspects of this bill and what is involved in it? Or would it not be wiser to give it the six months' hoist? Then, if any legislation capable of being dealt with by the Parliament

of Canada were introduced next session, we could give it the attention it deserves.

**Hon. Mr. Turgeon:** Within the last twenty-four hours we have had before us a bill to amend the Criminal Code. Various objections to provisions of that bill were taken by honourable senators; they were in exactly the same vein as the objection to section 6 of the present bill; yet that bill was sent to committee, was discussed, and will come up for further discussion, I understand, some time tomorrow. Why cannot we take the same course with respect to the present bill? The committee could make any report it deemed fit: it could declare that it had not sufficient time to deal adequately with all the matters contained in the bill.

I admit that I have read the present bill only since the honourable senator from Waterloo began his speech, and I must therefore also admit that I have not a thorough knowledge of what it contains. Section 6 is outstanding; section 5, possibly, is questionable; however, I am ready to listen to or take part in discussion in committee, and I urge that the bill be sent there. I believe that honourable senators would do more to advance an object in which we are all interested—the improving of public sentiment towards the Senate—if, instead of giving the bill the six months' hoist, we sent it to the committee with a view of getting a report.

At the same time, as I have said, I am prepared to vote against section 6, because in my view it contains less of foundation principles than of methods for attaining objectives which are opposed to the constitution which created the Senate. I reiterate however that I would have to oppose a motion to suspend the bill for six months.

**Hon. Wishart McL. Robertson:** Honourable senators, I cannot effectively rebut the complaint that this legislation has been introduced very late in the session. The fact speaks for itself. But this is not the first time such a thing has happened, and probably it will happen again. Years ago, long before I was a member of this house, similar protests were heard. Undoubtedly they expose a very weak spot in our governmental procedure.

Another weak point, to which I have already referred, is that the whole responsibility for introducing and explaining government legislation in this house is left, officially at least, to one representative, although in the other place the same task is distributed among thirty-two Cabinet ministers and parliamentary secretaries who are versed in every detail of the matters committed to them. It is humanly impossible for any one person to clearly explain