

ments to the Bill. It seems to me that, under this Bill, not merely \$75,000, as my hon. friend says, but a great deal more will be expended, because if there are to be fifty inspectors, at \$1,200 a year, there will have to be clerical officers employed as well. At any rate the increase in the trade, consequent upon the falling into disrepute of American goods, justifies us in assuming that our own trade will soon double itself, and we shall be thus launching out into an expenditure which is bound to attain the sum of \$200,000 or \$300,000 before long. And this inspection, which we are to provide at this great expense, is not going to benefit us in any way. It is merely to apply to meats intended for export. You may have five or ten establishments in any one province, canning goods for export and for home consumption, and this large sum we are going to spend is to be spent merely on the inspection of the food for export. Why should it be limited to food for export or intended to be sent from one province to another? Why should it not apply equally to food for consumption within the province? The reason is not far to seek. This legislation is copied from that of the United States. But in the United States the federal congress has no right to legislate regarding the inspection of meats canned within the state for consumption within that state. It can only legislate with regard to the inspection of meats intended for export or inter-state commerce. But here we are not limited in our legislation in that respect, and can provide for the inspection of canned goods for use within the province as well as outside. It seems to me therefore that we ought to give the people within the province the benefit of that inspection as well as the people outside. There is another point to which I would call my hon. friend's attention, by the amendments he proposes, making any attempt to conciliate the working of the legislation, at present in existence, with this new legislation?

There is an impression that we have no inspection laws here. Is that true or is it not rather the case that this new law, this Bill introduced by my hon. friend, is going to have for its effect to bring into conflict the Department of Inland Revenue and his own department. We have an inspection law perfectly adequate to all the purposes which my hon. friend the minister has been discussing so lengthily. I refer to the Adulteration Act, chapter 107, Revised Statutes of Canada, an Act respecting the adulteration of food products, commercial fertilizers. That Act with its many amendments gives an almost perfect law of inspection at the present moment, being administered by the Department of Inland Revenue, with a system of inspectors, reports and analyses, with large powers conferred upon the officers of that department, and all the machinery necessary, with perhaps some additions, to fulfil all the objects which

Mr. MONK.

this Bill has in view. To take a concrete case, the minister by this Bill provides for a certificate which the officer acting under this Act respecting the inspection of meats and canned goods will deliver, and which before any court of law will be absolute proof of everything stated in that certificate. Well, supposing an officer of the Department of Inland Revenue, with the powers which he possesses under present legislation goes into a canning establishment inspected by one of my hon. friend's officers, the officer of the Minister of Agriculture has delivered a certificate that the canned goods are in perfect order, fit for export and in conformity with the law. But the officer of the Inland Revenue Department goes in there, takes out one of these samples of canned goods, submits it to the Dominion analyst and that Dominion analyst, after examining it, finds it defective and delivers a certificate, as he can under the legislation at present in existence, that that canned meat is unsafe and defective. Who is going to reconcile these two certificates before a court of law? In other words I do not think that this legislation is necessary even as ancillary to chapter 107 of the Act Respecting the Adulteration of Food.

One word on the existing law, which I think with a small additional expense and perhaps some amending legislation would absolutely fulfil all the purposes of this Bill. Let the members of the Commons read section 2 of the Adulteration Act. Section 2 defines what adulterated food is. It covers nearly three pages of the statutes, and among other enumerations is the one contained in sub-paragraph 5 of subsection 'E':—

(Food is adulterated) if it consists wholly or in part of a diseased, or decomposed, or putrid or rotten animal or vegetable substance, whether manufactured or not, or in the case of milk or butter, if it is the produce of a diseased animal, or of an animal fed upon unwholesome food.

And then as I said before there are two pages of the statute enumerating what constitutes adulterated food, covering almost every imaginable article of food to such an extent that to-day with the amendments that have since been introduced, the food which is fed to bees before it is converted by them into honey is defined by the statute to be adulterated food. Look at the whole text of the Adulteration Act. Section 3 provides for the appointment of analysts; section 6 provides for the appointment of inspectors and defines their powers; section 7 provides how samples may be obtained, and legislates in the broadest possible way that any officer may procure samples of food products or agricultural fertilizers, which have been heretofore exempt from the provisions of the Act, from any person who has such articles in his possession, and submit them to the analyst; section 10 provides for the certificates, how they are to be issued;