

trouble in getting 94 pounds of cement into the sacks we are now using; I think there is room for 10 pounds more.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I suppose that the object is to have a sack of uniform size as between Canada and the United States?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is well to have uniformity.

Mr. CASSELMAN: I can see that uniformity is desirable, as we are getting closer and closer to the United States in trade and other matters. I am told that a short time ago the United States endeavoured to have the weight of a sack of cement raised to 100 pounds, but the opposition was so strenuous that the idea was abandoned. I am also told that the tendency in the States now is to reduce rather than increase the size of a sack of cement and that there is an agitation on in the United States with that object. The larger the sack the greater the waste, on account of sifting; the cement comes through the pores of the sack. In the early part of the discussion the minister spoke of the necessity for marking packages with the name of the maker and the weight, but this amendment will make it unnecessary for those details to be placed on the container. The cement will be sold on the basis of a sack of 94 pounds or a barrel of 376 pounds. The old sacks, so long as they are used, will only hold  $87\frac{1}{2}$  pounds. The price will be based on a sack of 94 pounds, and the price to a buyer will be eighty-seven ninety-fourths of the price of a bag of cement. When it is remembered that there are fifty thousand retail merchants in the Dominion of Canada handling cement, it can at once be seen what annoyance and confusion would result if this became the law. I repeat, in the earlier clauses of the Bill the minister is providing that the weight shall be marked on every container, but in this particular instance the weight need not be specified. The uniform weight was  $87\frac{1}{2}$  pounds, but now it is proposed that a container can hold any amount and the weight need not be specified at all. That is inconsistent. I am told that the present sacks will not hold 94 pounds, and if that is the case the small sacks will have to be thrown into the discard ultimately. I understand that cement sacks in use at the present time are valued at \$2,000,000 and at this time when everybody is being urged to do everything he can to save and conserve, it seems to me that by this change we would be foisting a tremendous loss upon the people of Canada, and the loss would ultimately fall

upon the consumer and nobody else. I would suggest to the minister, in all humility, that he withdraw the whole Bill. If the Bill were reprinted as it now stands, with all the erasures and the amendments and the amendments to the amendments, I doubt very much if the minister would recognize it. The modern tendency is to simplify business: this Bill complicates business. I would further urge upon the minister that Bills of this kind—legislation compelling people to do things they do not like, or restraining them from doing things they want to do; legislation seeking to cure only minor evils—should be avoided. Almost every day a new order is issued by the Food Control Board. I am not criticising that board in its entirety, because I believe it has done a lot of good. I can point to an instance in which the Food Control Board has saved in one branch of Canadian trade and industry the whole amount paid in salaries to that board.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman apply the same freedom of treatment which he is now laying down to the merchandise we use, or to the Coinage Act?

Mr. CASSELMAN: I would have to consider that. I am not familiar with the Coinage Act, but I have a knowledge of the cement trade, and the produce trade of Canada, and I am speaking from that knowledge. When so much new legislation is necessary, I say that legislation only curing minor evils should be avoided; and I would, in all humility, suggest to the minister that he withdraw this Bill.

Mr. CURRIE: What line of business does the hon. gentleman refer to, when he speaks of that great saving?

Mr. CASSELMAN: The egg trade.

Mr. McKENZIE: I agree entirely with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Casselman), as he understands this business, and if he says we are going to throw away \$2,000,000 worth of bags—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not so.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would not undertake to say that is not so, but if the hon. minister makes the statement I suppose the hon. member for Dundas will accept it. I do not wish to join issue on the question of fact. The hon. gentleman has made a statement—and he appears to know something about it—that we are going to forfeit bags to the value of \$2,000,000, and if the statement be true, it is a matter for the