

fects, and the Portland Cement Association. This last association is composed of the cement manufacturers themselves. All those associations in the United States have adopted the 94-pound bag, and the standard size of the 94-pound bag in the United States, I am informed, is the size which is being used in Canada for the packing of cement, namely, 17 by 28 inches. Furthermore, I may say that, as the result of a very elaborate test made by the Government, it has been established beyond all peradventure that the bag will hold 94 pounds of cement. It is not unreasonable that there should be statutory authority as to what should constitute a bag of cement, and we have no such authority at the present time. We simply recognize that in practice the weight of a bag of cement is 87½ pounds; but, inasmuch as we have legislated upon standard weights for almost every other commodity, there is no good reason why a law should not be placed upon our statute book defining what shall constitute a bag of cement, even if we were to legislate that 87½ pounds should constitute a bag.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: What advantage would there be in fixing the weight at 94 pounds rather than 87½ pounds?

Hon. Mr. BOYER: It equalizes the standards.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It is to equalize the standard weight with that of the United States.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: We are trucking and trading with the States now.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But we are not importing cement in any considerable quantity.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: At one time we imported larger quantities of cement.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: Yes, during an election in Arthabaska.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: And there is nothing to prevent our importing it.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: Cement is imported in very small quantities, indeed, and only in British Columbia.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I am not saying that we are importing very large quantities.

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: And the cement imported in British Columbia does not come from the United States.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: Is there not a relation between the 94 pounds and the cubical contents of the bag?

Hon. Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know about that.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: I was told that 94 pounds means a cubic foot.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: However, I am simply pointing out to honourable gentlemen, though not with a desire of persuading them into a state of sympathy with the Bill, that the Government has been justified in assuming that the public desired this legislation.

As to cordwood, we have no statutory authority as to what constitutes a cord of wood. True, as my honourable friends have pointed out, it is in practice 128 cubic feet, and of course practice has almost the sanction of law, in a sense; but we have nothing on our statute book requiring that that number of cubic feet shall constitute a cord of wood. When this Bill was introduced into the House of Commons it provided arbitrarily that wood should be sold by the cord, but through a great deal of ingenuity a clause was devised whereby it was provided that wood might be sold otherwise than by the cord. Thus the effect of the legislation was very largely neutralized. Under the Bill, so long as a man does not sell wood by the cord, he can sell it in any sized load he may desire; but if a man places upon the market a load of wood and says that it is a cord of wood, he is bound to give the consumer 128 cubic feet.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: Would it not improve the Bill to make it state what is a cord of wood, and that it shall be 8 feet long and 4 feet high? What is a cord of wood? How am I going to get 128 cubic feet if I have no precise measurements?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: By what is known as the multiplication table, if the honourable gentleman has one handy.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: Suppose I buy a load of wood and the man from whom I buy it tells me it is 128 cubic feet; have I to measure every stick?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: No. You multiply the length by the width and height. However, I have no desire, against the wishes of members of the House, to obtrude upon them this Bill. In view of the adverse opinions which have been expressed on both sides of the House, I prefer to ask that the Committee rise and report progress, and I shall communicate