

—bags, cans, boxes, and articles of that kind—and compel the farmer or the trader to buy other packages when the price of everything is enhanced at least 100 per cent. It seems to me that is a reason why this Bill should be properly studied and given mature consideration before being submitted. We ourselves should also have sufficient time to study it.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I have freely to admit that there seems to be a slight unfriendly draft in the Chamber in connection with this Bill. I attribute it to the fact that sufficient time has not been given to study it, as my honourable friend from De Salaberry (Hon. Mr. Béique) has said. I feel assured that, if we had time for proper consideration to be given to the Bill, it would have a very much more favourable reception. Last week a general complaint was made on the part of the farmers of Canada that they had very few friends in Parliament; but anyone coming within this Chamber this morning would easily conclude, if they were not familiar with the honourable gentlemen who constitute it, that every member of this Chamber is a farmer.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: The farmers went to the wrong Chamber.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: As I listened to the championship of the farmers by my agricultural friend from Alma (Hon. Mr. Foster), it seemed to me that hereafter the farmers of Canada could rely upon the Senate to represent thoroughly their views on any agricultural question, even though it might include cement and kindred subjects. This Bill, as honourable gentlemen are probably aware, was considered last session in the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Last session?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It may not have received the most friendly consideration last session; but during the present session the House of Commons did approve of the Bill; consequently we have it before us this morning for our consideration. Honourable gentlemen have all conceded that no exception can be taken to the principle. If the principle of the Bill is good, we certainly should be able to frame and develop the Bill so that it will protect the interest at least of the consumer; and I venture to say that in protecting the interest of the consumer it will likewise protect the producer. In listening to my honourable friend from Wentworth (Hon. E. D. Smith), who seems to be very much

opposed to the Bill, we were all convinced that what was done in the interest of the consumer was done likewise in the interest of the producer, because there is a mutuality of interests between them; and, if we can introduce into our legislation principles that will inculcate honesty on the part of the producer, we accomplish a great deal. Of course, the consumer is always conceded to be perfectly honest; but if we can crystallize into our legislation the principle of honour and honesty on the part of the producer, we are making a considerable advance. No exception can be taken to the principle of the Bill.

As to the desirability of information being stamped upon containers, as provided in the Bill, that requirement has been adopted in almost every civilized country. This Bill is practically along the lines of legislation which has been adopted not only in the United States but elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: Made in Germany.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: That may be possible. There are many things in Germany, particularly in commercial matters, that might be very well adopted in this country.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: No, not one.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: The honourable gentleman is pro-German.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: My honourable friend from Alma refers particularly to the question of cement, and it was dealt with likewise by my honourable friend from Rideau (Hon. Mr. Edwards), and very properly so. If this Bill in any way might effect an injustice to large manufacturers or producers, it is the duty, not only of the Government, but of both Houses, to consider to what extent those interested are prejudiced. Parliament exists, not for the purpose of wrecking the interests of the producer, but rather to protect them. True, the manufacturers of cement may not have had that notice which was desirable, in order that they might make a proper study of the Bill; yet the information of the Government is that even the cement bag mentioned by honourable gentlemen who have discussed the Bill this morning will readily hold 94 pounds. Now, 94 pounds is the standard weight of a bag of cement adopted in the United States—adopted by the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Society for Testing Materials, the Railway Engineering Association, the Concrete Institute, the United States Government, the Institute of Archi-