

Does the addition of fat foreign to the milk necessarily produce a deleterious effect in all cases?

Mr. FOSTER. It makes an inferior article—yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am desirous of doing everything that can be done in reason to encourage and protect our cheese manufacture, which is one of the most important we have. Who is responsible for the legal part of this Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend that this Bill was prepared by the advice, and under the direction of Professor Robertson for a purpose which is patent in the Bill itself—to prevent the production of the spurious imitations of cheese that are being put upon the market. I am not an expert any more than my hon. friend, but I know that Professor Robertson has gone over the Bill very carefully.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fine provided is "not exceeding \$500 and not less than \$50." That is a pretty severe punishment for what, under certain conditions, may be a comparatively venial offence.

Mr. FOSTER. We might consider the penalties when we come to that clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think the provisions of this section will be found to be just in their application upon all occasions. There is no definition here of what kind of fats may be used to incorporate with skim milk in the manufacture of cheese, and I believe that wholesome cheese can be manufactured in this way if the skim milk is enriched with fats that are not deleterious. This clause would absolutely prohibit the manufacture of cheese from skim milk enriched by any kind of fat whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. Anything foreign to the milk.

Mr. CHARLTON. I imagine there should be some definition as to the kind of fat that might be used. Cream is a fat, and other fats might possibly be used that are nearly as unobjectionable as cream. I see that later on in the Bill it is provided that cheese may be made of skim milk, but it must be branded in some way. It strikes me that this Bill is not carefully drawn, and that the prohibition of the use of fat altogether is going a little too far.

Mr. FOSTER. This Bill is represented to be of very great importance.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who drafted the clauses of this Bill, Professor Robertson?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; they are his entirely.

On section 3,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a clause that might, under some conditions, be the means of inflicting very great hardship.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose we make the maximum \$200. You must have a pretty good fine or it will not be deterrent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object where there is a deleterious adulteration, but I draw a distinction between mixing the skim milk with innocent substances, and adulterating with injurious fats, and, therefore, I think the minimum penalty ought to be considerably reduced.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same time, the maximum penalty ought to be kept up, because, to a large establishment, any light fine would be a comparatively unimportant matter. I would move that the minimum penalty be \$25 instead of \$50, leaving the maximum as it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I approve of the general purpose of the Bill; but we must not forget that we are creating an absolutely new offence, and, under the circumstances, I think we had better guard against the imposition of excessive penalties. However, if you make it \$20 or \$25, I think it would not be objectionable.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the House should take into consideration that a person may be innocently selling this substance believing that he is selling cheese that is not adulterated. It seems to me it would be a tremendous hardship to subject such people to the penalties of the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was just going to suggest an amendment to the first clause that would meet the objection that the hon. the Speaker has raised. I would suggest to leave out the words "have in his possession," making the clause read "no person shall manufacture, buy, sell, offer or expose for sale," etc.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be better to amend it so as to read "no person shall manufacture, or knowingly buy, sell," and so on.

Mr. LAURIER. Why not put "knowingly" after "shall."

Mr. FOSTER. A man cannot manufacture this substance without knowing it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was the reason this Bill was introduced?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to keep up the credit and standard of our cheese.

Mr. CHARLTON. In some of the western states the character of their cheese is so much deteriorated by additions of that kind that it is hardly saleable.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to read an extract from a letter in the "Grocers' Gazette," of England, dated 4th March, and directed to some of the Canadian operators in cheese:

In the first place, great injury has been done to the reputation of Canadian produce, as well as to the