

us leave the United States alone for a while, and let us save money to our people by allowing them to use these sacks. Let us either drop this section or take a vote in regard to it. I move that the clause as amended be dropped.

Mr. CURRIE: I hope that the hon. member will not press his motion. He has given a long argument endeavouring to prove that no good purpose is served in having this standard weight. The Bureau of Standards have certainly given this matter great consideration. One reason for this standard is that in the United States there are a great many text-books used by engineers—

Mr. BUREAU: Are we legislating here under the President of the United States and to please the United States, or are we legislating for our people?

Mr. CURRIE: We are not legislating under the president of any cement company, as my hon. friend wants us to do; we are legislating for the people of Canada. The text-books that are published in England and the United States are used by cement companies and they are used by engineers in estimating the cement work they do. There are some engineers here who know that very well. There are certain specifications laid down for certain work. There are buildings erected of cement; even ships are being made of cement. The American text-book says that you must make a cement of a certain standard, and that when you use so many barrels of cement to so much weight of sand and so much weight of gravel, you get a certain specified product. When you put that in a wall or an arch, you put a certain strength there that will stand up to a certain weight; but if you have only 87½ pounds instead of 94 pounds to the bag, your work will not stand up. The inspector will come along and pick out a piece of concrete to see how much cement is in it, and he will say: You have not the correct quantity. The result is that your work is condemned and you lose a great deal of money.

Mr. MORPHY: I am told on very good authority that, notwithstanding anything in the text-books about standards, the common practice throughout the whole of the United States is to use a standard bag of 87½ pounds, not 94 pounds. Will the hon. member dispute that statement? The minister will not.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. CURRIE: Nothing of the kind occurs. The standard text-book in the United States is Trautwine & Kent's text book, and Trautwine & Kent are the authorities used by every young engineer or old engineer, and the standard there is 94 pounds to the bag of cement.

Mr. MORPHY: I am not speaking about what is written in a text-book. I am asking the hon. gentleman if he will deny that the practice throughout the United States is to work to the standard of an 87½-pound bag, and not a 94-pound bag?

Mr. CURRIE: That may be the practice on sidewalks and other work in which it is not necessary to have standard cement, but throughout the whole of the United States the standard laid down in the text-books is the standard laid down by the Bureau of Standards, and that is the weight laid down in this Bill. The two parties who are going to suffer on account of short weight in cement are not the hon. gentlemen who want to have this section thrown out, they are the public and the dealer. If I ask a dealer to sell me five barrels of cement, I shall certainly insist on getting that weight, but the cement companies will short-weight the dealer five pounds to the sack. Is that fair to the dealer? I say, it is not. A man who does not know enough to weigh his cement will suffer, and not the dealer. The reason for standardization is apparent. We have standardized in almost everything now, and there is no reason why cement should not be standardized. Why should one company which plays the game honestly, which manufactures cement and puts it into bags to the proper weight, have to compete with a concern which is short-weighting everybody? Short-weighting in cement should be stopped so far as the farmers and the rest of the people are concerned. It means a great loss. The people do not get full value for ten per cent of the cement that is sold.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend (Mr. Currie) asked me to withdraw my motion and to think it over. I asked him for whom we were legislating, and he said: The people. I agree with him that we are legislating for the people, but by this Bill we are legislating for the people of the United States. If you cause a loss of \$2,000,000 on account of wastage in bags, who is going to pay that? The American manufacturers? It is the consumer who is going to pay it. My hon. friend is looking at this from only one angle. He may have behind him all