

Mr. MCGEE: Might a person not be permitted to lay the groundwork for his question in this committee?

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that you proceed, Mr. McGee.

Mr. MCGEE: The final conclusion of the exchange between the witness and Mr. McCleave did not satisfy me in that the minister indicated that it would be looked into; and I wondered if there was more positive statement that might be made. Because if that is the pattern that has been followed in this case, and it is followed in others in my experience, I do not think the results of the committee—if I judge the feelings of this committee correctly—would be obtained.

Mr. MONTEITH (*Perth*): Mr. McGee, I think I might put it this way: I have seen advertising which was purely and simply misrepresentation. These people have come to me and I have agreed with the department. And I have had other people come to me with complaints which I think were quite justified. That is exactly what I meant and still mean as far as Mr. McCleave's question goes.

Mr. MCGEE: Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Mr. MCCLEAVE: It might help on this subject if I should send along to the minister representations of this company, Moirs' and several others.

Mr. MONTEITH (*Perth*): Give me the complete story, yes, bring it in to me. Ask them to come in and see me.

Mr. HOWE: I wondered, in getting to diethylstilbesterol, if it is combined in all types of stock feeding today?

Dr. MORRELL: No, it is still being fed to cattle that are fattening for market, that is, to cattle of a certain age and weight. But before we allowed that to be done, the manufacturers who were advocating the use of it, spent a couple of years doing research and investigation; and the evidence was that no trace whatsoever of diethylstilbesterol appeared in the meat as consumed. We are quite satisfied that this was on the basis of their information and of our own tests and experiments which we conducted at McDonald college on our own with the same material.

Mr. WINCH: I understood that these injections in concentrated form are cancer inducing. If it is not allowed in poultry, it is allowed in cattle? Do I take it from what you said that it can only be used in cattle for feeding purposes in a diluted form, when I am told it is not a cancer inducing element?

Dr. MORRELL: If I recollect the figures, it is 30 milligrams a day for a 600 or 800 lb. steer, or cow, whatever you call it; and a 25 milligram pellet which is put into the neck of the bird.

There are two distinct differences between poultry and cattle, in that the pellet which was put into the neck of the chicken is not always completely absorbed. If the head was not cut off far enough down, you have a residue of pellet in the chicken which would give you quite a dose; there might be one half or one quarter of it still left.

Also we have found in the tissue of chicken residues of diethylstilbesterol particularly in the liver and the subcutaneous fat. There is nothing left in the cow in terms of residue. No traces of diethylstilbesterol have been found in any of the tissues we have examined, and they included liver, fat, and muscle meats.

Mr. WINCH: I still think this is a heck of a way to use male sex hormones.

Mr. HALES: Has there been any research done in your department concerning the use of antibiotics in dairy feeds? I have heard of aureomycin, an antibiotic, being incorporated into dairy feed for dairy cows in order to