

The Bill was read the first time.

SECOND READING.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED moved the second reading of the Bill.

He said: Honourable gentlemen, this is a Bill which was introduced in the House of Commons by, I think, the member for South Oxford (Mr. Donald Sutherland), and was afterwards taken up by the Government. It proposes to prevent the adulteration of bran and shorts or middlings. It is said that in the making of bran and shorts ground weed seeds have been introduced to a very large extent, and there is nothing in the present Act to prohibit the introduction of any foreign substance. Consequently it is not only desirable but necessary in the interests of stock—and of good government likewise—that we should provide that in the case of bran and shorts or middlings it should be the product of wheat, and in the case of corn bran it should be the produce of maize or Indian corn. We propose to amend the Adulteration Act accordingly. The legislation is unquestionably good, and I therefore with confidence move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: I do not want to oppose the principle of this measure; but I do object to it being brought down in this way, without our having any opportunity of looking at it. I cannot even find on my file a copy of the Bill as introduced in the House of Commons. I for one have absolutely no knowledge of this Bill beyond the few explanations which my honourable friend has given to the House.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It is one of the earliest Bills brought down this session: it is No. 7.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: It is not even on my file of Bills introduced in the House of Commons. The object of the Bill appears to be a good one. I quite admit that we do not want to have bran and shorts adulterated.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Will my honourable friend pardon me? The Bill is on my House of Commons file. I will read the Bill, which contains only four lines:

In the case of bran and shorts or middlings, if it contains anything that is not a product of wheat, or in the case of corn bran, if it contains anything that is not a product of maize or Indian corn.

Then it shall come within the Adulteration Act.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: I find the Bill here. It had not been placed in the right order on

The Hon. the SPEAKER.

my file. When I looked for it before I could not find it.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: The Bill provides:

In the case of bran and shorts or middlings, if it contains anything that is not a product of wheat—

If that provision is carried out strictly according to the letter of the law, it will be impossible to get bran and shorts. There is, as a rule, no grain milled that does not contain something besides wheat, and whatever else it contains is ground up with the wheat. Grain is never so absolutely clean that it contains no foreign matter.

Hon. Mr. WEBSTER: I look upon this Bill as one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come before this House this session. People in Ontario who have been buying bran and shorts for the last five years have been simply humbugged by the millers of the West. Substances have been sold as bran and shorts that did not contain more than 25 per cent of bran. I brought a sample to a public analyst two weeks ago to-day. The substance had been sold as a high quality of shorts, and it had already killed six pigs in one herd to my personal knowledge. The analysis showed four distinct traces of poison. The principal ingredient in that substance was ground wild mustard seed; it contained also some chicken weed and chalk and limestone. Is that the proper way to obtain money from the farmers of this country, who are trying to improve their stock? Legislation of this kind should have been passed years ago, and I am very glad to see that a member from Ontario who has suffered very severely from these conditions has had sufficient nerve to bring in this Bill, and I want to support it.

Hon. Mr. McHUGH: The remarks of the honourable gentleman from Brockville (Hon. Mr. Webster) are quite correct so far as they relate to weed seeds or other substances that are injurious to the bran; but, as the honourable member from Portage la Prairie (Hon. Mr. Watson) says, it is impossible to get bran that is all pure wheat. The Bill as it is now worded is too stringent to be carried out. I quite agree with the honourable gentleman from Brockville that there is a great deal of fraud in the sale of bran. If it contains noxious weed seeds the quality of the bran is injured; but oats or barley or peas are not injurious. There are sometimes peas ground up in bran, and it is none the worse for that. If the Bill were amended so as to prohibit only injurious substances, I would like to see it go through.