

very little of it showed up at all. So it is obvious that if the proper precautions are taken you can get a zero of contamination. Therefore I do not think it is altogether impossible.

Mr. HOWE (*Hamilton-South*): What would be the purpose of the expense in removing something which is proven to be harmless?

Mr. BENTLEY: Well, of course, I am not in a position to say. I do not think we should spend money needlessly in trying to remove something if it is proven to be harmless. But you can get into an argument as to what is harmless and what can be harmful. The ideal situation is to try to obtain negative results in these things.

Mr. HOWE (*Hamilton-South*): There must be some substances which would be very costly to remove, and if they were proven to be harmless after investigation, why bother to remove them?

Mr. BENTLEY: I think that is perfectly right.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not want to get technical, but none of us here are experts. When you say substances are removed from milk, are they actually removed in the layman's way of thinking, or removed by prevention? In other words, if after testing milk is found to contain certain offensive substances, is that milk supply treated in some way to remove the substances, or does the producer say "your milk is contaminated and we will not take any more of it until it tests properly".

Mr. BENTLEY: As far as I know in the main they try to remove these substances. In other words, it is a pretty severe penalty on a producer to have to hold back his milk or to dump it down the drain.

Mr. NESBITT: Contaminated milk is not destroyed. When there are obnoxious substances in it, it is not put on the market?

Mr. BENTLEY: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? If there are no other questions, then on behalf of the committee I thank Mr. Bentley of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture for coming before the committee today and giving us his evidence.

Before we adjourn I would like to ask the members of the committee if they know of any person who has any further evidence they would like to have called before the committee?

In order to refresh your memory let me say that next Tuesday we shall have Dr. Coon, a toxicologist from Jefferson University, Philadelphia; on next Thursday we shall have the Cyanamid Company from Niagara Falls, manufacturers of insecticides and pesticides; on November 26 we shall have the Canadian Agricultural Chemical Association who will present a brief, and on Thursday, November 28, we shall have the food and drug directorate back before the committee again.

Mr. NESBITT: Have you ever thought of asking Miss Carson, who aroused widespread interest in this subject? I know she is a United States citizen, but perhaps she might be invited to appear.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the feeling of the committee on this matter? This was brought up in the steering committee and we did not think there would be anything to gain by it. I think everybody has read her book.

Mr. OTTO: Is she a technician or a specialist in these things?

The CHAIRMAN: She is a biologist, I think.

Mr. MITCHELL: In reply to Mr. Nesbitt may I say her book has raised a lot of controversy and argument. If she were called here, my impression is we would merely be rehashing a lot of adverse criticism that has already been