

was really little necessity for this Bill at all; that the fact that the fertilisers were subject to inspection would almost obviate the necessity of making a new law. The suggestion is that if the manufacturers of these fertilisers are obliged to put on the package a label stating the qualities and relative proportions of the ingredients of those fertilisers, and are subject to a penalty for the sale of fertilisers which do not contain the ingredients stated in the label, the desired object will be almost attained, especially if the officers of the Crown are given power to prosecute those individuals and to recover from them the penalties which are in this Bill of the Minister of Inland Revenue, called the Bill respecting the adulteration of foods, drugs, and agricultural fertilisers. Perhaps the Bill has already gone too far for the Minister to withdraw it, or to make such other provisions in the other Bill as would obviate the necessity for this measure, and as notwithstanding the disclaimer of the Minister of Agriculture there is no doubt this Bill is a Government measure, we can hardly expect this step to be taken. I understood that though the Bill was introduced by a private member, the First Minister promised to take it under his protection, an announcement of which I was very glad, because I believed then that the Bill was a necessity, and that such a Bill in the hands of a private member could not be carried into law this Session.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps some people are confusing this Bill with another, which may be called an extension of the Bill with regard to agricultural fertilisers. This Bill is expressly to prevent fraud in the sale of commercial fertilisers, and it provides for that in an ample and complete manner. No man can import or manufacture a fertiliser to be sold at \$10 a ton or over without giving an analysis of it, and a sample of it to the Department to which it belongs. Everybody selling these fertilisers is obliged to give to the public a guarantee that a sample of what he sells is sent to the authorities, and that sample must be accompanied by the affidavit of the manufacturer or importer stating that it is a fair sample of what he sells. The second guarantee is that you cannot sell at retail or wholesale, or as a manufacturer, unless you give to the purchaser a statement of what it is composed of. The third guarantee is that if you sell an article which is under the grade that has been given to the public by a certificate of the analysis, if you sell an inferior article, you shall be liable to a fine. The Bill may appear rather rigorous but I do not think it will be found so in practice. When it is known that the proper authorities will be the guardians of the samples which will be analysed, there will be the greatest precaution against trying to defraud the public. I have also received some letters since I have had charge of this Bill, from manufacturers and agriculturalists saying that they feared that the inspection will be compulsory, that they thought it might impose a burden on the retailer, and that the cost of an article selling at \$2 a ton might be increased by about \$2 a ton, which would be a high percentage on the article sold. I shall proceed to the examination of the different clauses, and I repeat that the Bill is essentially one to prevent frauds by people selling commercial fertilisers.

On section 2,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. After the words "of this Act" strike out all the other words until the word "they" at the end of the line, and instead of "\$12" insert "\$10". Also in the fourth and fifth line strike out the words "or potash."

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I would ask the hon. gentleman under what application this reduction in value is made from \$12 to \$10 a ton. I speak, of course, from my personal knowledge only, but with us in western Ontario, it is mostly the high priced super-phosphates that are offered on the

market, for which we pay \$30 to \$40 per ton. We are not familiar with those low grades which are placed on the market at less than \$10 per ton.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The demand was made by myself originally to the hon. member for Welland. I had occasion, when presiding over the Department of Agriculture in Quebec, to have imported some bi-phosphates which are made out of sea-weed, the refuse of fish and bones. These bi-phosphates were commercial fertilisers, and were sold at \$10, and I wanted them to be embraced in this Bill. They were good fertilisers, but at the time they were imported, by some accident, they proved unequal to their reputation, and were to a certain extent a failure; and consequently agricultural societies lost faith in commercial fertilisers.

Mr. BAIN. I can understand how desirable it is to bring all these agricultural manures within the range of the Act. Certainly I do not object to the Minister changing the figure from \$12 to \$10 per ton; I was asking for information. I can understand a manure at \$10 a ton being really cheaper to a farmer than another for which he pays \$40 a ton, in its effects upon his crops. There is, however, this difficulty. If you apply the same test to both manures that is required of all the manures which are examined by a practical analyst, and which contain a certain proportion of ammonia, or its equivalent of nitrogen, there will be a great deal more of impure ingredients added to the high-priced manure, unless you have some process by which you can reach the manufacturer of it. It ought to be richer in ammonia and its equivalents which really form the value of those manures for growing plants. I think it desirable that the Bill should be brought to apply to as low-priced a manure as is offered to the farmer for those purposes. I believe that in the eastern Provinces there is a large quantity of that manure manufactured from fish or bones and other ingredients which are otherwise of very little value, and I agree with the Minister that it is desirable that all these things should be brought within the range of the Act.

On section 3,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose in the second line to insert the word "January;" in the third line, after the word "year," to add "person offering the said fertiliser for sale;" in the fourth line instead of "one pound," to insert "two pounds;" and in the fifth line after the words "fertiliser, manufactured or imported by him" to insert, "with the certificate of analysis of the same."

Mr. FISHER. Sometimes a manufacturer is asked to make up a special fertiliser by order; and I suppose by the section as amended, he would be obliged when he sent that order to send a jar at the same time to the Department.

Amendments agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This section, which appears to be a repetition of section 3, is not. During the course of the year, when an offence may be prosecuted, the inspector will have a right to ask for a second sample from the manufacturer.

Mr. FISHER. Since the hon. Minister has amended the third clause, so that a certificate of analysis has to be sent with the sample, it does not seem to be necessary that another sample should be sent, especially as section 3 requires the manufacturer to send a specimen of every kind of manure which he may manufacture. It seems to me the 5th clause is entirely unnecessary, and will only give the officers of the Department work that is not intended, as well as hamper the manufacturers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the intention, I dare say, of the Department every year to publish with the analysis a description of the different kinds of soil to which each fertiliser would especially apply. That I think would be a great