

I think that this Bill is a step in the right direction in the interest of the consumers of this country. I do not say that it is perfect. But something should be done for the protection of the consumer to compel manufacturers and others to stamp the goods that they are selling.

Something has been said with regard to maple syrup and maple sugar. Why should they not be marked with the name of the producer and the quantity contained in the package.

Hon. Mr. WEBSTER: As any man buying maple syrup knows, the standard today is 13½ pounds to the gallon.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: Then what objection can there be to marking it on the container?

The question of wood is supposed to be a very trivial one, but I want to say that it is a very important one to the city of Ottawa. As an instance I will mention something that took place this year. There are hundreds of poor people in this city who are dependent on wood for fuel. What takes place? There is no standard measure.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Yes, there is.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: I beg your pardon.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: The law to-day, and for many years past, has been that a cord shall consist of 128 cubic feet.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: There has been an effort recently to induce the city council of Ottawa to pass a by-law providing that no wood shall be sold in the city except by the cord. The city council, through its controllers, pointed out that they had no power to do so, and they appealed to the Ontario legislature to have an Act passed. In Ottawa wood is sold for two, four, or five dollars a load, but there is no guarantee of the quantity contained in the load. During the winter time I saw a load of wood measured. A man brought in a load of hardwood cut in about 16-inch lengths. He sold it by the load. A neighbour of the purchaser saw the load and thought that it looked to be a splendid one. He said: "I will order some of that; how much wood is contained in that load?" The man selling the wood said: "I do not know; about 115 cubic feet, I think." The man brought the wood and it was put into his cellar. I happened to be on the premises at the time. I went and looked at the wood, and I said: "You have not got half a cord of wood there; go out and measure the rig." He measured the box of the wagon and figured it up, and if

the wood had been piled as an honest man would pile wood there would not have been more than 80 cubic feet in it. The man who bought the wood paid at the rate of nearly \$24 a cord for it.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: It is a question of honesty again. Did the seller guarantee to the purchaser that there were 115 feet?

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: No.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: How did he sell it—by the cord?

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: No.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: He sold it by the load, and any man who buys by the load deserves to pay what he paid.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: Some honourable gentlemen do not seem to want to do anything for the consuming public. They could easily say that no wood should be sold except by the cord.

Hon. GEORGE TAYLOR: This Bill does not say that.

Hon. Mr. SMITH: Look at section 350D.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: I do not say the Bill is perfect. I am pointing out the objections which honourable gentlemen have made to the Bill, ridiculing the idea of controlling the sale of wood. I contend that there should be a Dominion law which would compel men selling wood to sell it by the cord of 128 cubic feet.

Hon. Mr. RICHARDSON: What about the quality of the wood?

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: I do not know anything about the quality. Honourable gentlemen who have been speaking in the interest of the manufacturers and the farmers have overlooked the great consuming public. The man who prepared this Bill has evidently tried to take care of the consuming public. As I have said, this Bill may not be perfect, but I think there should be some intelligent effort made to protect the consumer. The suggestion for standardizing cans and containers is a good one, but the same objection which has been raised to changing the labels—the great expense—would apply to that also.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I think it is perfectly right that the consumer should be protected in every way possible; but, after all, the best consumers of this country are the farmers, and I think they are the parties who under this Bill will have most inflicted upon them. Many parts of this Bill and the objections to it have been so well ex-