understood from the minister that it was going to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration; otherwise, I should have fought it harder then. This is a very important project we are launching into, and it will require a great deal of consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I understood from the minister that we would be given the opportunity in that committee to make changes, and the bill requires several changes. In reply to my hon, friend from Hants (Mr. Martell), I would say that having a cold storage down in the beautiful land of Evangeline—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not want the hon. member to be under a misapprehension. This is the second reading of the bill, and though he is entitled to speak on the second reading, of course, this stage is preliminary to referring the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SPENCE: I was scared of letting it advance too far, but if it is going to the Committee on Agriculture I shall have an opportunity to make suggestions there. I was going to say to my hon. friend from Hants that having a cold storage down in the land where he lives, and which he admires so much, will never create a market for his stuff. More than that, having a cold storage sometimes leads holders of perishable goods to hold them too long; they do not put them on the market at the proper time. That has been my experience in the business. I have known many cold storages, and I do not of one in Ontario that has made any money. They are exceedingly hard to carry and cost a lot of money. If you subsidize cold storages, you will have to open wide the door and subsidize municipalities as well as co-operative companies. The other night municipalities were eliminated from this resolution, and I took exception to that. If this bill is going to be of benefit to the fruit growing industry or to any part of the Dominion, I am willing to support it, but it is obvious there is not much demand for it when for the past four years we have not had a single municipality demand a cold storage subsidy. There are two or three cold storages in Toronto, and not one of them is making money. If this government undertakes to go into the cold storage business or to subsidize cold storages, it will be a losing investment, and we should be very careful especially in these times, when we are talking so much about economy, that we do not go too far. I am willing to discuss this further in the Committee on Agriculture, when I shall try to point out to the minister where he is wrong.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

LIVE STOCK ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill No. 10, to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting Live Stock.

He said: This is a consolidation of the original act of 1917 and of amendments thereto. It has in addition certain new features, not of a very radical nature, but yet fairly important.

The bill provides for the better control of stock yards. While the act is named the Live Stock Act, the title does not seem to me to fairly represent its purpose. The purpose briefly is for the proper control and establishment of stock yards, and stock exchanges associated therewith, and also to give to the by-laws and regulations of such stock exchanges, the status of law.

The bill also provides for the organization of exporters' associations, very much like what we have in the West in the shape of small shipping associations. Some of the provinces have a statute providing for the organization of shipping associations in order that the farmers may unite and ship their live stock collectively. The bill also provides for the inspection of animals prior to slaughter, and for the establishment of an egg-breaking plant where low grade eggs may be taken care of by breaking and freezing, or breaking and drying.

The administration of the act will be about as before. I think I explained the provisions pretty fully on the resolution.

Mr. MILLAR: In the Farm and Ranch Review of December 20th appears an article which may have a bearing on this bill, for I see it refers to stock yards. It says:

This relates to the gangs hanging around all places where cattle are received from the farms—kind of speculators, who buy old cows and broken down dairy stuff direct from the farmers for \$8 or \$10. They then ask for a test. Where infection is disclosed, the animals are condemned and the speculator gets \$40 for his investment.

This questionable traffic has grown to considerable proportions around Winnipeg. Farmers do not, of course, engage in this sort of thing. They are glad to get the small amount the old stuff sells for to these speculators. Their cattle are consigned to commission men who, of course, are not expected to call for an inspection until the stuff is ready to leave the yards. By that time the speculators have made their purchases. Not infrequently drovers go over the prairies buying nothing but the old cattle that are likely to react to the test for infection and for which they expect to receive, in that event, \$40 from the government.