

only to confusion and irregularities. The minister may be adding additional expense to the purchaser of chop feed by compelling the man to place tags upon all bags of chop feed, and some simpler and cheaper way of getting over this might be devised. My experience is that large handlers of chop feed in many cases send out their own bags to the mill and have them filled. They buy this feed on sample and in most cases they are quite satisfied. I am not sure that there is any great demand amongst feeders throughout the country for tags on chop feed from whole grains, and in this connection I am speaking of whole grain only. That is the only comment I have to make upon that feature of the resolution.

I should like to draw the attention of the minister to clause 17 which reads:

That this proposed Act shall not apply to feeding stuff sold to a manufacturer for the purpose of cleaning or mixing.

That particular clause will allow western elevators to sell, as they have been selling, all kinds of rubbish and weed seeds and escape the penalty. I should like the minister to say whether my understanding of the clause is correct.

Mr. TOLMIE: The tags referred to by the hon. gentleman will not involve a great deal of cost and they will afford the purchaser a good deal of valuable information as to the exact contents of the feed. When the stuff is sold in loose lots not contained in sacks all that will be necessary will be to place the label on the bin, indicating the exact contents so that the farmer may be fully apprised of the nature of his purchase. Clause 17 permits any farmer to purchase a carload of these feedstuffs and have it ground under his own supervision, and he knows exactly what he is getting under those conditions.

Mr. ROBB: But the miller is also permitted to grind the stuff.

Mr. TOLMIE: The miller will be caught by our inspectors the moment he offers the stuff for sale. In many cases we purpose to have inspectors on the ground visiting the mills from time to time to supervise the mixing and preparation of feed, both at the point of origin and at the point of distribution.

Mr. ROBB: That is quite correct. But why are you going to penalize the miller for buying and grinding these noxious weeds when you do not penalize the elevator man who first sells them?

Mr. TOLMIE: He sells to the miller, but we do not step in until the miller proposes to sell the stuff for feed. We make analyses from time to time in order to see that these feeds do not exceed in quantity the limit of weed seeds, etc.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has not yet convinced me that there is not a select class who will not come under the operation of the Bill and who will not be penalized for selling noxious seeds. I submit that there is no basis of equity upon which the minister can allow the grain elevator or cleaning house with impunity to sell these dirty, noxious seeds, and place the penalty upon the second person who handles it.

Mr. TOLMIE: I think it is desirable that the miller or the manufacturer, as he might be called, should have the right to purchase these screenings in bulk so that he may dispose of them in any possible way he sees fit so long as he acts in compliance with the law. In accordance with the Bill, he may extract those portions suitable for making feeds; he may take another portion suitable for sheep feeds, or what used to be called some time ago, seed screenings; or he may export those parts of the screenings that are not suitable for feed. He should certainly have these privileges, and as everything will be done under inspection, the moment he tries to make any misrepresentations he is not only liable to penalty but may have his license cancelled.

Mr. WILSON (Saskatoon): While I appreciate the purpose of the resolution, I think there are some phases of it that will be almost impracticable in actual operation. There is no doubt that there has been a good deal of abuse in foisting upon unsuspecting purchasers feeds that could not, when properly tested, come up to the standard advertised. I notice in clause 2 that every bag or container shall have affixed to it a tag giving the specific amount of every ingredient contained in the feed. That is to say, if there is 10 per cent of weeds, 25 per cent of oats, etc., you will have to state the different percentages that go to make up the 100 per cent. That is easily enough arrived at. But the last paragraph of the clause says that there must be an analysis, guaranteed by the manufacturer, which shall show the percentage of protein fat and fibre. Now, that is one impracticable feature of the resolution; from the standpoint of one who is some-