

sugar" or "imitation maple syrup" or "compound maple sugar" or "compound maple syrup," so that the purchaser of such an article shall receive due notice that what he is buying is in fact a "compound" or an "imitation" of maple sugar or maple syrup and thereby will not be deceived as to what he is purchasing.

Subsection 2 is to the same effect as the latter part of subsection 1 of section 29 (a) of last year's amendment, that is to say, it throws the obligation on the vendor of maple sugar or maple syrup, who does not comply with the standard of proving that the article is really maple sugar or maple syrup.

Subsection 3 is the same as subsection 2 of section 29 (a) of last year's amendment, with the exception that the words "which is or" are struck out.

Section 2 of the Bill amends sections 31 and 32 of the Adulteration of Foods Act. Section 31 is amended by adding the words "and not less than \$25 and costs," in subsection (b) after the word "costs" in the third line thereof. In the Act as it stands at present, there is no minimum fine, and it is deemed advisable that a fine of \$25 as a minimum should be imposed in cases of violation of the Adulteration Act, covered by this section.

Section 32 is amended for the same reason, the words "and not less than \$50 and costs," are added after the word "both" in the fourth line of subsection (a), so that a minimum fine should be imposed in cases of violation of the Act provided for by this subsection.

The words, "and not less than \$25 and costs, and for each subsequent offence a penalty not exceeding \$200 and costs, or six months in jail, or both and not less than \$50 and costs," are added to subsection (b) after the word "then" in the fourth line of said subsection (b). These two sections of the Act (31 and 32) are deemed incomplete as they are at present, and it was thought advisable to amend them in the manner suggested.

Section 37 of the Act is also repealed, and the amendment as suggested in section 3 of the proposed Bill is substituted therefor. The intention of this amendment is to reach the vendor of an article resembling maple syrup, who does not label this article as being an "imitation" or a "compound," and also provides for a higher minimum penalty, also for a penalty for subsequent offences, which section 37 as it is at present, does not provide for.

Subsection 40 of the Act is repealed, and replaced by the section appearing in section 4 of the present Bill. The intention of this amendment is to give the person who gives information or otherwise helps in the detection or violation of the Adulteration Act, one half the penalty. It is expected that this amendment will be a great help to the department in the application of the law and the detection of all violations thereof.

I understand that the most contentious question in regard to this Bill is whether the law should entirely prohibit the sale of compounds of maple syrup or maple sugar, or whether this trade should be allowed to go on provided the public are made aware that they are buying a compound or imitation article, and are not buying pure maple syrup or pure maple sugar. The reason in favour of allowing this trade to go on is that many people cannot afford to buy the pure article, but would like to buy the compound, which is cheaper. I am inclined to believe that there would be no objection to such sale so long as the public are made aware that they are buying the imitation; and I think that is one of the worst evils from which the maple sugar industry is suffering—that to-day the adulterated stuff can be sold on the market without my department being able to interfere to prevent it, even though the purchaser may be under the impression that it is pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup that he is purchasing. Under the present Act dealers may sell adulterated sugar or syrup provided they put no label on the package. The aim of the Act is to force the man who manufactures a compound or makes any adulteration of the sugar or syrup to announce it to the public and put on his package the word "imitation." So long as the maple sugar is pure the dealer is not obliged to use any label. Articles which have no labels on are supposed to be pure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The objection to this legislation, which comes so soon after the Act of last session, is that to some extent it favours adulteration. Adulteration is one of the evils of this modern age. Scarcely anything that comes upon the table is not in some way adulterated by some industrious man who derives a profit from doing so at the expense of the consumer. The manufacturers of maple sugar last year interviewed the Government protesting against the adulteration of maple sugar, and had it made an offence. I think every-