

confidence and integrity of Canadian shippers, by the unprincipled conduct of some firms who have shipped New York State and Wisconsin cheese as Canadian.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** I am quite in accord with the Government in the desire to protect the high character of our cheese. That is a perfectly legitimate protection.

**Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).** I agree with the member for South Oxford with regard to preventing cheese being manufactured in such a way as to commit fraud upon the purchaser elsewhere, and to discredit the cheese manufactured in Canada. That is a perfectly legitimate object. Here the hon. gentleman provides that cheese made from skimmed milk shall be marked, and so on. Now, it may be possible that by using other ingredients a fair article of cheese not deleterious might be made, but here you undertake to interfere with the manufacture of such cheese. Suppose it should really turn out that by the use of something else than the fat of cheese a superior article could be made, why should you, by legislation, interfere with that? I can well understand how you ought to insist upon its being marked, and make it penal for not marking it, so as to distinguish it from other varieties of cheese; but I do not know that you would be doing just right to say that it should not be manufactured at all. This section says:

No person shall manufacture, buy or sell, offer, or expose, or have in his possession for sale, any cheese which is manufactured from or by the use of skimmed milk to which there has been added any fat which is foreign to such milk.

Now, I say that I do not know that a cheese so produced might not be a superior article; therefore we are legislating against the production of something that might be a fair article to put upon the market. When you legislate so as to compel parties to mark their cheese in such a way as to distinguish it from the cheese of other varieties, I think you have gone as far as you ought to go.

**Mr. WOOD (Brockville).** There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says; but in effect he means that a compound article of food which does not contain deleterious substances, ought not to be prohibited, but should be branded, following out our legislation with regard to deleterious food. With regard to the article of lard and some other articles which are compounds, the only restriction upon their manufacture is to label them as such. But I assume that in the case of cheese there ought to be an exception because we are proud and jealous of the reputation our cheese has attained in the English market. I dare say it was in the mind of Professor Robertson that if a compound was allowed in the case of cheese, that compound would find its way to the English market, and come into competition with our cheese, and in that way injure the reputation of our pure cheese.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I would call attention to the wording of this second clause. Any other than skimmed milk would not come under the operation of this Act at all. Any ingredient to strengthen, or fatten, or increase the richness of the milk, other than skimmed milk, would not come under the operation of this clause.

**Mr. WOOD (Brockville).** Other than fat, you mean.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** If they use ordinary milk, that is not skimmed milk, and then they can add fat.

**Mr. WOOD (Brockville).** Certainly.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** In order to settle the point as to their guilt, you would have to prove that it was skimmed milk; and if they do not use skimmed milk, if they use good milk, and if they make a larger amount of cheese thereby, although not as good, you cannot reach them.

**Mr. WOOD (Brockville).** The Act does not contemplate going so far. If by any other means they can make an article of cheese from pure milk, the Act does not contemplate any restriction of their right to do so. But I take it that the object of the Bill is to prevent any article made from skimmed milk being exported and coming into competition with pure cheese, even though it was marked compound. It may be the extreme of jealousy; but having regard to the very high character of our cheese in England, I would like the section to be retained, at all events for the present.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and of guarding the high standard of our cheese, but I think the Bill as now framed will not meet that object. Supposing a man uses good milk, and he adds something else to it that will seriously deteriorate the standing of the cheese, but will increase the quantity; supposing he puts something into good milk that will produce a good deal more cheese, but the cheese is not as good, he does not come under the provision of this Act.

**Mr. WOOD (Brockville).** Do you mean to say that by so doing it would result in the manufacture of a deleterious article?

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I have no doubt it might.

**Mr. WOOD (Brockville).** If so, the present law regarding the adulteration of food provides an ample remedy.

On subsection 2,

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I suggest that the fine be increased, the minimum being \$25.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I think we had better keep that.

Bill reported.

**Mr. FOSTER** moved the third reading of the Bill.