

the standard text-books, but that will not cheapen cement, if the manufacturers have to lose \$2,000,000 just for bags. This legislation will also entail new machinery to bag the cement, because the present machinery will pack only 87½ pounds to the bag. So far as presidents of cement companies and manufacturers of cement are concerned, let me tell my hon. friend that I do not own any stock in any cement company, and that I am not interested as a solicitor in any cement company. I am speaking in the interests of the people. I am a free lance, not the agent of any text book, or here to boom any text book author. Whatever I think will be in the interests of the people, that I will stand by. I have a lot of respect for the United States; I think we ought to have followed them long ere this in many things. But just because we have delayed we should not now try to go too fast to make up for lost time. The present weight of a sack is 87½ pounds, and if no manufacturer or consumer objects to it why should we change the standard? The Americans are not asking for a change. If they were I might even go the length of saying we should consider it. But nobody is asking for a change. A week ago the minister introduced a Bill and left the famous egg section on the Table for a week, and now today after a week's consideration he drops the egg section. If the minister leaves the present Bill over for a week he may change his mind on this matter too. I have no doubt his intentions are good; standardizing the weight of sacks may be all right, but when I see a general clamour against it, when somebody is going to lose by the change—and if the manufacturer loses in the first instance, the consumer will have to bear the loss eventually—and when nobody is complaining about the present weight why should we change? I have heard my hon. friend go all over the land saying, "Let well enough alone." Let him let well enough alone in these times of stress. Let the Bill stand over until he has got more information upon it.

Mr. CROWE: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion. I have used a little cement in my day. The cement that came into Canada many years ago, and has been coming in ever since, is from Great Britain. There the standard is 350 pounds to the barrel. The standard weight of a sack is 87½ pounds. Great Britain is the first producer of cement and why should we change our standard to conform with the United States?

Mr. TOLMIE: The question was asked some time ago why it was necessary to have a standard of 87½ pounds. I have a letter here from the managing director of the Portland Cement Company of Victoria in which he states that the present weight of a sack of cement is 87½ pounds, and that 87½ pounds is as near a cubic foot as any weight that could be specified. As cement is all used by measurement, this writer says that there is a lot to be said in favour of retaining the 87½-pound sack.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is some other business that we want to do to-night. I have listened carefully to everything that has been said and have made notes of the various suggestions. I still am of the opinion that we ought to have a standard weight; I think that would be in the interest of the consuming public. I do not see any force at all in the argument of my hon. friend from Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Mr. Bureau), whom I respect very highly, when he takes as his two premises that there would be a loss of \$2,000,000 if this legislation went through, and, secondly, that there would be no gain to the consuming public, who have made no request for this legislation. Two premises like those do not heighten my respect for the conclusion he has drawn, because neither premise is correct. There will be no loss on the bags, and there has been a widespread demand for this change. The idea of having a standard for our products in this country is an absolutely sound one. That was the reason why this clause was inserted in the Bill. I now beg to move that the committee rise and report progress. I shall take into consideration the suggestions that have been made, and in a day or two shall come to the committee with my conclusions.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—THE FLAX INDUSTRY.

On motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce) for Committee of Supply:

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this House, in view of the universal world shortage of flax and other fibres used in industry, resultant from the devastation wrought in those countries which have hitherto been the world's largest producers, and in view of the peculiar adaptability of the soil and climatic conditions in many parts of Canada for successfully growing flax and