

and that the inspection should not be based upon those small samples which the manufacturers deliver once a year to the Minister of Inland Revenue. I agree with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) that a great deal of fraud is committed against farmers by manufactures of so-called fertilisers, and the inspection is certainly very proper.

Mr. POPE. I am fully in accord with the hon. gentleman as to the frequency of the adulteration of fertilisers, but I cannot agree with him in some other of his remarks. Suppose you have 50 barrels of a fertiliser in a manure. You put that in a heap and divide it into quarters, then you quarter each one of those again. And so you go on until you get a quantity upon which you can make a proper assay. The thing the hon. gentleman speaks of could not happen in England. Now the course usually pursued in this country, the United States and England is this: I am going to send 100 barrels, say, of mineral to market. Following the course I have pointed out I make my assay, I reduce it down by mixing it up in the way I have described until I get it, perhaps, down to a shovel full, and with that I make my assay. This cargo is sent to the furnace or to the parties who buy it, and it goes through exactly the same process again. If the two assays differ 2 per cent, or whatever per cent is agreed upon, then the whole thing has to be gone over again. The one is a check upon the other. I do not know what it is proposed to do here, but if it is really intended to take out a lump here and a lump there, there is no certainty at all, and would not be a reliable assay.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not want to be considered as charging the English purchasers of phosphate with intent to defraud. I was only repeating the representations that have been made to me; I know nothing personally about it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). There is no doubt that the question involved in this Bill is one of growing importance to the agriculturists of this country. In the older Provinces especially there will be each year a growing demand for these artificial fertilisers, and we ought to see, if possible, that the farmer receives fair value for the money he pays out for these artificial manures. From the very nature of the trade there are special facilities for adulteration on account of the small proportion, according to bulk, of the elements in the manure that are of special value to the farmer, and it is easy to add to this a larger quantity of an inferior grade. Though it increases the bulk it depreciates the value of the manure for agricultural purposes while it increases the profits to the manufacturers. The case referred to by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) is a fair illustration of the difficulty. The very circumstances of the business show that the fertilising value of phosphate direct from the mines must fluctuate according to the condition in which it comes from the mines. It does not strictly come within the range of the article spoken of by this Bill, for the reason that, while it is the basis of an agricultural fertiliser, it is not in a condition to be available, because experiments have shown that phosphates, when finely reduced and applied to the soil in their natural condition, are almost of no value. They are simply the basis from which a valuable portion of these artificial manures are produced, but before they are of practical value they require to be treated with sulphuric acid or some other strong preparation to put them in a soluble condition. The percentage of the valuable element in phosphate must vary very much according to the care exercised in taking it from the mine, for the reason that phosphate is found in veins running through rock which is useless for agricultural purposes, and just in proportion as the phosphate is separated from the rock will the analysis be high or low. I believe at present the best samples of phosphate vary from 80 to 83 per cent. of soluble elements. A very large pro-

Mr. LANGELIER.

portion of the output of the mines will not analyse more than 60 or 65 per cent. It is clear that, so far as the farmers are concerned, phosphate analysing 80 per cent. is much more valuable than that analysing only 60 per cent. It seems, however, difficult to establish any basis of inspection for phosphate, except an inspection of each lot shipped. The crude phosphate is mainly shipped to Liverpool, Glasgow and Paris as ballast, it being mixed there with other ingredients and converted into superphosphate and sold to the farmers of the old world. With respect to the practical value of the artificial manures sold to farmers, it is an entirely different branch of the question, and it is involved in the Bill now under consideration. Those fertilisers vary very much in value according to the addition of inferior matter to bring up the bulk and weight. It is a matter of prime importance to the purchaser that they should have a certain fixed standard of valuable elements, which form a very small proportion of the weight of the article, because in a comparatively pure state they would kill growing crops. Only last Session a Bill on this subject, introduced by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue), was passed. That Act only went into force on 1st June last, and it made provision that an analysis should be attached to each of the samples of artificial manures manufactured and placed on the market for sale. That is undoubtedly the direction in which we require to go. I desire to ask the Minister whether that Bill has been practically put into operation and whether it has been found effective; or whether the Government have simply assumed the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), forgetting that the Act to which I refer was placed on the Statute Book. I agree with the Minister in charge of the Bill that this is a matter of growing importance to agriculturists; but I should like to know in what respect the Bill of the hon. member for Richelieu, now on the Statute Book, has failed to accomplish the object sought to be attained.

Mr. MASSUE. In answer to the hon. member who has just sat down, I may say that the present Bill is far ahead of the one I proposed last year, because I had no means of asking the Minister to appoint inspectors. The Council of Agriculture of the Province of Quebec would have been very glad to induce the agricultural societies, thereby the farmers, to use for their crops the best of the fertilisers; but having no means of detecting the good from the poor qualities, the council did not dare to induce the farmers in using what it had no means to recommend; but with this Bill I think we will be sure of the qualities of the different kinds of fertilisers, and, in my opinion, the Bill stating that the inspection will be under the control of the Minister of Inland Revenue will be a great help to the farmer in securing a good article for him, and to the manufacturer, in obliging him to be up to the mark.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FISHER. Some little time ago, after the Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), when I said a few words in support of the principle of the Bill, I received a communication from one of the largest fertiliser manufacturers of this country, known as the Standard Fertiliser Chemical Co., in which they drew attention to several parts of the measure. I examined the Bill pretty carefully with reference to the Bill of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue) last year, and also with some reference to the Bill passed this afternoon. I find, Sir, that these manufacturers have come somewhat to the same conclusion that I had pretty nearly arrived at myself, which was, that the law of last year, and the Bill putting agricultural fertilisers in with human and cattle food, subject to the inspection of the Inland Revenue officers, there