Mr. VENIOT: In part 1, after specifying the receptacles you mention also "any other receptacle." Why specify crocks and tubs and then leave them out of part 2?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In part 1 we have the definition of package as meaning any box, tub, crock, tin, crate, paper wrapper, carton or any other receptacle; in part 2 a number of receptacles are mentioned followed by the general statement which covers any other receptacle.

Mr. VENIOT: Why were tubs, crocks and tins left out?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): There was no reason for leaving them out but I see no reason for putting them in; it was just a matter of description.

Mr. VENIOT: Why were they included in part 1?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): A number of things were described and then in order to cover the whole field we have the words "any other receptacle."

Mr. VENIOT: Why not make it just "any receptacle"?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I see no objection to that but I also do not see any gain in making that amendment.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I notice the explanatory note reads:

It is proposed to use inspectors appointed under the provisions of part 1 of the act to assist in enforcing the provisions of this part and the regulations made hereunder.

The minister stated a few moments ago that the small farmer would not be disturbed by the government inspectors or surveyors. I recall a case in my county about two years ago where a number of farmers got together in order to produce butter. They were not producing on a large scale such as a cooperative society would; they were producing only in a small way, but they got into trouble. I went to the department and saw the officials and as this was their first offence, they were very lenient. I think this bill would cover the farmer who was manufacturing butter in a small way on his farm, possibly with the assistance of his sons or his family. In the case to which I referred the complaint was made in Quebec city and I had to get it settled. I think we should have something more than the assurance of the minister that the farmer producing butter in a small way will not be subject to the provisions of this bill.

[Mr. R. Weir.]

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): It would be impossible to define any limit. In the case referred to by the hon. member, a number of farmers got together to produce and sell their butter. What distinction would there be between that and a creamery? I claim that the purposes of the act can be best served by leaving it just as it is now. It is intended to prevent any violations which may occur. The understanding always has been that a bona fide farmer manufacturing butter on his own farm would not come under the purview of these regulations.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I should like to make a suggestion in connection with the question raised by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Veniot): Would there be any objection to saying that a package means any box, paper wrapper, carton or any other receptacle and then add "without restricting the generality of the foregoing" or words to that effect?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I see no objection, but I see no gain.

Mr. ELLIOTT: May I point out what the gain would be. If it is left as it is, "Any box, paper wrapper, carton or any other receptacle or covering," unless the words I have suggested are put in, "any other receptacle or covering" could refer only to any receptacle or covering of the same type as those previously mentioned. That is the difference.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I regret that I must disagree with the hon. member. As "package" is defined in either case it is broad enough to cover all conditions. Perhaps I am in order in suggesting, in the kindliest possible spirit, because this is a matter for free discussion, that there should be a revision of the composition of the agriculture committee; otherwise it is pretty much a loss of time to take these matters up before that committee.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Does that mean that this will be referred to that committee?

Mr. BENNETT: It has been there.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): It has been gone into fully by them and returned to this house without amendment.

Mr. CASGRAIN: But as I said a little while ago, we did not have an opportunity to hear all the explanations given in that committee. We cannot be everywhere; we haven't the gift of ubiquity.