

should be mixed with anything else. I am satisfied that if the Bill embodies the clauses of the resolution as set out here, it will result in its being almost impossible to purchase bran and shorts in their pure state. You will find that this legislation will be used to bolster up other mixtures and enable them to be sold on the market. I believe the Bill contemplates the mixing of bran and shorts rather than to ensure their purity. The farmers of this country can do all the mixing, if they desire a mixture.

As far as chop feeds are concerned, those are very easy to regulate. I was somewhat surprised to hear the minister state in answer to the hon. member from Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) that the millers should be in a position to purchase these screenings. It is well known that the standard stock feed to which the hon. member for Marquette alluded was due to the desire of placing on the market a standard stock feed from those screenings, and it was contemplated at the outset that the stuff would be ground fine to destroy the vitality of the enormous proportion of noxious weeds contained in it. This thing has been played with to such an extent that one is inclined to look for the joker in legislation dealing with commercial feeding stuffs, and there was certainly a joker in the Order in Council of December, 1917, dealing with commercial feeding stuffs. After specifying that the mill-feed should be pure this clause was enacted. It is not a Bill; it is an Order in Council of December, 1917, and it reads as follows:

The presence of presumably vital weed seeds in any form of feeding stuff shall be held to constitute adulteration under the Act, when more than twenty-five seeds per pound, as enumerated in the Seed Control Act, 1911, are present in the feed.

This Section 17 permits twenty-five vital weed seeds but Parliament, under the Seed Control Act, has provided for what are termed noxious weeds; consequently all the vital, non-noxious weed seeds that millers see fit to put in may be put in. There is as well no limit to the quantity of devitalized seeds they may put into their feed stuff. This is what took place when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was Minister of Agriculture, and it has resulted, I venture to say in more trouble and dissatisfaction among the agriculturists of this country in regard to feed stuffs than anything that has happened during many years. The prices which were received for screenings before the war according to the

[Mr. Sutherland]

evidence of the general manager of the United Grain Growers which we have, were not the high prices which have been alluded to by the hon. member for Marquette. The average price paid for three years previous to the war was \$4.91 and for the last six years the price was \$8.84 per ton. This was after the Government placed an embargo on the export of screenings. The report which I read from the Dominion analyst at the last session in regard to bran and shorts was convincing evidence—I think it convinced this House and it certainly convinced the members of the committee on agriculture—that something was necessary to control the operations of the millers. Their contention was that it was perfectly legitimate for them to adulterate by reason of the legislation and the Orders in Council which have been passed. When they were up for examination on this question they said: "If it is so necessary and advisable to exclude these weed seeds, why does not Parliament take action in the matter?" Yet we have the Act of last year attempting to deal with this matter by standard and the other provisions of the Adulteration Act have been taken care of in two Bills which have been introduced by the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Rowell). The resolution before us this afternoon does not contain the provision which I think it should.

Just a word or two in regard to the regulations which may be enacted by the minister if the Bill to be introduced should go through in the form of the resolution. The resolution provides that the minister shall have power

To appoint an advisory board which may at his request define for his guidance and recommend regulations that may be established under the proposed Act.

In referring to that to-day he stated there should be some elasticity to the Bill in order to allow the department to make such changes as might be deemed advisable. I am not sure but that there may be some force in that argument but I think it is advisable, in so far as it is possible to do so, to define in the Bill exactly what we want done in regard to matters of this kind because by the appointment of boards of that kind you are not going to bring about the desired result. I believe that the minister, with the expert assistance of the heads of his department, should be in a position to define what should be necessary and to propose legislation along that line in the Bill rather than that he should appoint boards

3 p.m.