

On subsection 3 of section 1—use of word “maple” restricted to pure maple sugar or syrup:

Mr. BLONDIN: I move that the following words in the second line of page 2, after the words “maple syrup,” be struck out:

And no package containing any article of food, or any article of food itself, which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

Mr. GLASS: I would like to understand this matter a little better. The chief sites of the manufacture of maple products are in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and there is a strong desire amongst the people in the part of the country from which I come that the fullest protection should be given to the honest product of the manufacturer of honest maple sugar. What is the reason for deleting this portion, which primarily the minister considered of sufficient importance to be incorporated in the Bill? It may be all right, but I do not understand it.

Mr. BUREAU: I made the suggestion as a result of the change made in section 29a of the existing Act by striking out that part of the section authorizing the compounding or imitation of syrup. It was necessary to repeat the same words in section 3 of 29a, but, having been struck out where they first occurred the words had no meaning or use in subsection 3. The effect of dropping these words is that it is not permitted to put the word “maple” on anything except on the pure stuff.

On section 2—re-enactment of sections 31 and 32:

Mr. BUREAU: What are the changes in sections 31 and 32, of the old Act?

Mr. BLONDIN: Section 31 is amended by adding the words “and not less than \$25 and costs” in subsection b, after the word “costs” in the third line. In the Act as it now stands there is no minimum fine.

On section 3—false label or neglect to label:

Mr. KAY: Does this mean that the manufacturer of maple sugar or syrup must put a label on his article?

Mr. BLONDIN: The intention is to reach the vendor of an article resembling maple syrup and provide for a higher minimum penalty and also for an additional penalty for each subsequent offence, which section 37 as it is at present does not provide for.

[Mr. Blondin.]

Mr. KAY: It does not mean that the farmer must label his sugar or syrup?

Mr. BLONDIN: I do not think it does. I think the words, “neglects or refuses to label or mark any article of food or drug refer to the general law. I do not think there will be any difficulty as it stands at present.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—application of penalties:

Mr. BLONDIN: The intention of this amendment is to give one-half the fine to the person who gives information or otherwise helps in the detection of violations of this Act. It is expected that this will be a great help to the department in the application of the law, and the detection of all violations thereof.

Mr. BUREAU: I see this is to repeal section 40 of the old Act. Was there a similar provision in the old Act? I am not going to enter into an academic discussion of the principle of giving half the fine to an informer, but I do not see why the Act should be changed. There is no department in the whole Administration that has so many inspectors as the Department of Inland Revenue, and I do not see why the minister should need extra assistance from the outside public. I am willing that the producer should be fully protected, but I say that this will give an opportunity to unscrupulous men to attempt blackmail. For instance, under the provincial regulations in regard to liquor licenses there have been cases where complaints have been made by informers, who when the trial came on had no evidence whatever, and the department had incurred a lot of expense for nothing in getting samples and having them analysed. This will just give an opportunity to some men to go around leg-pulling with the merchants and threatening to lay information against them for dealing in a product that is not within the provisions of the Act. Considering that the minister has at his disposal a great number of inspectors who go around the stores every day in the year, and have the privilege of taking any samples off the shelves and forwarding them to the laboratories for analysis, I do not see why this inducement should be given to the blackmailer.

Mr. BRODER: The department cannot have an inspector in every sugar bush, and some of this dishonest work is done in the sugar bush as well as in the shop; that is,