

rest upon the manufacturer, dealer, carrier or other person in whose possession the binder twine is found.

Mr. BENNETT: This is quite different.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, and I shall have it checked. Meantime I ask that the section stand.

Section stands.

On section 7—Reconditioned or rewound binder twine.

Mr. GARDINER: I have an amendment suggested by a firm of binder twine distributors which I shall ask my colleague to move.

Mr. DUNNING: I move that the following be substituted for section 7:

7. No person shall sell, offer or have in possession for sale as binder twine in Canada, any binder twine which has been damaged by fire or water unless:

(a) in the case of damaged binder twine which has been reconditioned, the original tags on the balls of twine have been removed and replaced with tags labelled in accordance with section 6 of this act, and in addition with the words "Reconditioned Binder Twine," and the original markings on the sacks containing the damaged binder twine have been obliterated or concealed, and the sacks, or labels durably attached thereto, labelled in a conspicuous manner "Reconditioned Binder Twine" or,

(b) in the case of damaged binder twine which has not been reconditioned, the original tags on the balls have been removed and replaced with tags labelled in accordance with section 6 of this act, and in addition with the words "Damaged Binder Twine," and the original markings on the sacks containing such damaged binder twine have been obliterated or concealed, and the sacks, or labels durably attached thereto, labelled in a conspicuous manner "Damaged Binder Twine."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—Prima facie evidence of improper labelling.

Mr. BENNETT: I believe this is what the experts call random sampling. During the sittings of the price spreads commission the question of random sampling came up and it was found to be highly unsatisfactory. One in twenty is a pretty wide margin, is it not?

Mr. GARDINER: It is the section as it stood in the previous act.

Mr. BENNETT: I know it is.

Mr. GARDINER: It must have been found to be fairly satisfactory as I have had very little complaint with regard to it.

Mr. SENN: Have there been any convictions under this section?

Mr. GARDINER: I have no record of any, but there may have been.

Section agreed to.

Section 9 agreed to.

On section 10—Offences.

Mr. BENNETT: Subsection 2 is important.

Mr. SENN: This is one reason why I drew the attention of the minister to the definition of "dealer" and to the fact that a dealer is liable if the binder twine does not comply with the regulations. For instance, he is liable if the binder twine does not run 600 or 500 feet to the pound as it may be represented. It would be impossible for a dealer to know this and he is not in a position to find out. If he is a retail merchant I do not think he should be held responsible for a difference of five per cent in what is represented. That would be a very difficult position in which to put a dealer. After all, five per cent is quite a wide margin. With binder twine running 600 feet to the pound, that would amount to thirty feet. If a farmer buys binder twine supposed to run 600 feet to the pound and gets only 570 feet, that is too great a difference.

Mr. GARDINER: I have not had an opportunity to inquire into this section. Section 6 has been allowed to stand, and I should imagine it is just that thought which was in the minds of those who were responsible for redrafting this section. If section 6 is drafted to take care of what the hon. member has in mind, then there should be no difficulty with this section.

Mr. SENN: Does the minister not think that five per cent is quite a wide variation? Surely manufacturers of binder twine putting out twine to run 600 feet to the pound should be able to come within thirty feet?

Mr. GARDINER: That has always been the standard, and I believe it has been found to be quite satisfactory.

Mr. SENN: That would be quite an item where a man was buying a large amount of binder twine.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not going to argue this point because I am not sufficiently familiar with it, but I think five per cent is rather high. When we come to consider salt we find it stands in the same position. Five per cent is rather a large margin of tolerance in connection with a commodity that runs 600 feet to the pound. I think it is going pretty far when it is no violation of the statute to be short thirty feet in 600 feet.