

section 11 for the effect of the certificates ; section 12 for the case of an appeal from a local analyst to the Chief Analyst of the Dominion. And then you find in article 14 and following what will constitute adulteration of food, and by articles 22 and following severe penalties are imposed on all those who are found to have in their possession adulterated food as defined by section 2.

Now that very general legislation which enables the Minister of Inland Revenue to name the inspector, which provides for analysts, which provides for the punishment of all those who have adulterated food in their possession, has been amended and extended, by chapter 54 of 51 Victoria, by a very long Act, to be found in chapter 26, of 23 Victoria, extending the powers of the departmental officials and by chapter 12 of 56 Victoria. All that legislation concerning the adulteration of food has been put into operation ; officers have been named and they exist at present all over the Dominion. The department has been fully organized, and it has a sub-department, the department of inspection, the department which is charged with guarding against all kinds of adulteration is a department which I submit to this committee is fittingly under the control of the Department of Inland Revenue. What does this Bill provide ? It provides at a very great cost for another set of inspectors, a new sub-department in the Department of Agriculture, which department I think, if it carries out its mission in regard to agriculture in this country, has its hands full already. It organizes in that department a new department of inspection, a department absolutely analogous, to the department already existing under the Adulteration Act and this great additional expense is going to be added for the purpose of inspecting only food for export and for transference from one province to another, so that in case of a canning company in the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec which will distribute its goods entirely within the province, the people of the province will derive no benefit whatever from this Act. It seems to me that in this case there must result a clash of authority between these two departments and that this legislation is absolutely useless. If it is necessary to multiply the number of officers who are going to be charged with the carrying out of the Adulteration Act which dates back a great many years, let us add a few officers, let us add some officers who will be especially delegated to look after food for export. This is a matter of a few thousand dollars, but why we should organize within the Department of Agriculture this separate department at such a great cost when not one person in the Dominion or outside of it has asked for this special legislation, I am at a loss to understand. It seems to me an absolutely useless expenditure of money. In the Inland Revenue Department we have the officers. If it is required to add to their

number or to increase their power, we can amend the Adulteration Act. I have noticed that the Minister of Inland Revenue was present during the whole of this discussion up to a few minutes ago ; he is watching this Bill. The object of this Bill is to take away from his department a part of the patronage which legitimately belongs to it, and to bring it into the department of my hon. friend. It seems to me we ought to pause before we enact this legislation, consider seriously whether it would not be more sensible, more practical, to strengthen the officials who have charge of the Adulteration Act, to fortify the Department of Inland Revenue so as to meet the new circumstances which have been referred to by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. But I say that before five years, if we pass this legislation, we will be expending \$200,000 or \$300,000, if we administer the Act in the way proposed ; whereas, with an expenditure of \$25,000 or \$30,000 at the utmost, we could strengthen the officials having charge of the Adulteration Act, and attain the very same object, without breaking the harmony that ought to exist between the different departments of this administration. I would like to know if my hon. friend has thought of that ?

Mr. FISHER. I can say to my hon. friend that we have thought of it. The Minister of Inland Revenue and myself discussed that question, and he is quite satisfied not to assume the responsibility of administering this Act, or of trying to amend his own Act so as to cover the points herein contained. I would say to my hon. friend that his points with regard to the export and home trade have already been threshed out in committee, and it has been proved conclusively that the Bill, as slightly amended, is the most feasible way of dealing with the situation. I do not want to assume a new responsibility unless it is thrust upon me. The General Inspection Act and the Adulteration of Food and Agricultural Fertilizers Act, do not cover the objects of this Bill ; and to amend these Bills so as to cover the purposes we have in view, would involve as great an expenditure as this Act will involve, and create a good deal of confusion. I regret that my hon. friend was not present on the three previous occasions when this Bill has been in committee. I would like now, if the committee will concur, to ask the chairman to take up the Bill clause by clause.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend says that the Adulteration Act does not apply to any of these circumstances. Let me suppose an instance. There is a man conducting a canning establishment here in Ottawa, we will say. The inspector having authority under the Adulteration Act can to-day go to that establishment. He sees a quarter of beef hanging up ready to be canned, he has authority under the law to take down that