

Mr. CHARLTON. It is to be regretted that legislation of such an important character should not have been brought down at an earlier period of the session. We have been unable to give it that attention to-night which it should have received, and I am afraid that the Bill will prove to have been rather hasty legislation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite in sympathy with the object of the Bill, but those who attempt to administer the law will have to recommend changes in several provisions next session. I do not think any magistrate will be able to understand clause 2, with respect to the component parts of cheeses, to enable him to impose a fine. If it is anything else than skimmed milk, the man who is brought before the court will be dismissed. It will be necessary for those who bring the accusation to prove that the cheese is actually made from skimmed milk. If it is not, it does not come under the provisions of this Act at all. The hon. Controller says that it would come under the provisions of the Adulteration Act. It would not, unless it is a poisonous or injurious ingredient.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Not at all. If the substances put into the cheese are deleterious in their nature, it would not come under the Adulteration Act unless the substances are injurious to health. But I fail to see the force of the hon. gentleman's contention. He puts the case of cheese into which, fat, or something that benefits the cheese, is added. The scope of the Act does not cover such a case; but the hon. gentleman is supposing a case that is absolutely impossible. No person in his senses would ever think of doing such a thing.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Bill (No. 132) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to draw the attention of the committee to this circumstance. The Bill provides that the deduction of six days shall not apply in the case of a member who has been elected during the session; but it does not state that it shall not apply in the case of a member who has been unseated during the session, and the question may arise as to whether a member who has been unseated during the session and who has not lost any days during the time he has been sitting, should not be allowed the six days. I think that cannot be the intention of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not know whether it is intended to include the case of a member who, through no act of his own,

Mr. FOSTER.

although elected before the beginning of the session, was prevented from taking his seat owing to some proceeding being taken to contest his right. Is it proposed to take from him the time that elapsed before he was actually introduced to the House? I think we have on several occasions recognized the right of a member---

Mr. FOSTER. That has only been done by an appropriation in the Estimates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may cite the case of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), who was elected on the 4th January, but who was not allowed to take his seat until fourteen days after the session opened, although he was here and ready to take his seat. He was the representative of L'Islet, as declared by the result of the election; he was as much its representative the moment the election was over as he is to-day; but because of some proceedings being taken against him, the declaration was not made.

Mr. FOSTER. This Act will not cover a case of that kind.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### CUSTOMS ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 126) further to amend the Acts respecting the duties of customs was read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by reducing and remodelling the duties on iron.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would the hon. gentleman consent to strike out the words: "twine for harvest binders," and make it read, "twine, hemp, jute, manila," and so on. By taking out those words he will not interfere with the policy he has adopted, and will include lath yarn, which is very largely used by a large number of manufacturers, who mainly find a market for their products in the United States and have to pay duties on the value of the article which they ship, including this very twine. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that it would not at all affect the principle of his proposition to say, "twine, hemp," and so on, leaving out the words, "binder twine." That would simply widen the provision or rule he proposes.

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to oblige my hon. friend, but I am afraid I shall have to keep that over for consideration until another session.