

that is not characteristic of all mechanical bagging machines. I am told—and I take my facts from those who seem to know—that it is impossible in bagging cement to get a uniform filling.

With reference to the other articles with which we dealt to-day and in regard to which we have imposed a penalty, it must be remembered that there was an allowance made for discrepancies.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would the minister give us his authority for that? I have had a long experience in both measuring and weighing and I know whereof I speak. I have measured and weighed for forty years, and in the light of that experience I assert that mechanical weighing and measuring is much more accurate than any weighing or measuring done by the human hand. That being the case, I fail to understand why allowance should now be made for bagging flour or vegetables, or canned stuffs of any kind. The underlying principle is the same in every case, and it would apply in one case the same as in another. My hon. friend sitting beside me says that it is a matter of political efforts. I shall not illustrate or elucidate that statement.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is an unworthy assumption.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand that section 360 provides that cement shall be sold by the weight and that you are doing away with the bags. Is that right?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, no, the bag remains, to put the cement in.

Mr. BUREAU: But cement is not bought by the bag, it is bought by weight.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Certainly.

Mr. BUREAU: What weight is going to be fixed? Will it be the weight when sent out by the manufacturer or the weight that the cement will scale when taken off the cars? I do not think the bag is going to cut any figure. Cement will be sold at so much a ton or so much a hundred pounds, just the same as coal.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is provided in the Bill that there shall be a proper bag to hold the cement.

Mr. BUREAU: You cannot control leakage from a bag. Why force a man to pay so much for a bag of cement when the weight, not the bag, is the measure of the transaction? I repeat my question: What weight is to be accepted? Is the purchaser

[Sir George Foster.]

to pay for the weight of the cement when it reaches its destination, or for its weight when it left the manufacturer? If there is any discrepancy where is the purchaser's remedy? I suppose it will be a matter of contract as to whether the purchaser buys the cement f.o.b. at the place of manufacture, or delivered at a siding; and if the cement is short in weight the manufacturer will have to make it good? But as regards the marking of the bags I cannot see any necessity for it when the cement is bought by weight.

Mr. TOLMIE: I understand there is something like \$1,680,000 worth of cement sacks now held by the cement companies, and it is a very difficult matter indeed for them to get new sacks at the present time. Therefore, I want to know if it is made perfectly clear in the Bill that the sacks now on hand will be permitted to be used?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Absolutely clear.

Mr. MORPHY: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister in a specific and undoubted way certain statements contained in a letter written to me by a gentleman who thoroughly understands the cement business. The first statement is as follows:

What is mystifying to those of us in the cement business is the underlying cause for what appears to us a perfectly foolish piece of legislation. Who stirred it up and what actuated it? Where was the demand that Sir George acceded to? It certainly did not come from the manufacturer. It surely could not have come from the consumer, because the 87½ lb. sack comes nearer filling in a rule of thumb way specifications for the use of cement than any other way could possibly do. Why is there to be a 94 lb. sack in Canada and an 87½ lb. sack all over the United States? Are contractors who take contracts here and in the United States to be faced with a different sack weight in making their mix?

The writer speaks of the matter in other respects. He is a gentleman who is in the cement business in a large way, and his statements are very specific. I would like to ask the minister where he gets his authority for the statement that the 87½-pound sack is not the standardized sack in the United States, but that the 94-pound sack is?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I got it from the circular of the Bureau of Standards, which, on inquiry, was sent to me. I got it also in answer to a telegram sent to the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, in Washington. The answer to that telegram was this:

Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, advise that the weight of bag and