

Mr. ROGERS: That is changing the boundaries altogether. It is going too far.

Mr. DOHERTY: That amendment was handed to me as a result of a conference of yesterday. I am not myself sufficiently familiar with the geography of the district to know exactly what the change means.

Mr. ROGERS: If we adopt that amendment, we adopt the principle that we decided not to take into consideration

at all, that is, the changing of the boundaries. I understood this Bill was simply to correct errors made in the descriptions of the electoral districts. This opens up a wider field altogether.

Mr. PARDEE: I understood from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Achim) that a piece had been taken out of the city of Hull which should have been left in. South Hull was really transferred to another riding, although that was not the intention of the original Act at all.

Mr. ROGERS: It may be all right, but I think we had better allow the section to stand.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will have it recast.

Subsection 6 stands.

On subsection 8—Portage la Prairie:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the change here?

Mr. ROGERS: Under the Act as it now stands, the portions mentioned are included both in Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. They will now be Winnipeg alone.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 9—Springfield:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what electoral district will the portions named be included?

Mr. ROGERS: According to the Act as it now stands, they are included in both Winnipeg and Springfield. They will now be in Winnipeg alone.

Subsection agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

MAPLE SUGAR AND SYRUP.

On motion of Hon. P. E. Blondin (Minister of Inland Revenue) Bill No. 114, to amend the Adulteration Act was read the second time, and the House went into

[Mr. Doherty.]

Committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the Chair.

On section 1—imitation or compound maple sugar or maple syrup to be labelled:

Mr. ROBB: Last session a deputation of the maple sugar makers of Canada was introduced to the Minister of Inland Revenue, and upon their recommendation a Bill on this subject was passed by Parliament. Will the minister please explain why it is that he comes before Parliament to-day asking for an amendment of that Act of last session? Upon whose demand is this new legislation introduced?

Mr. BLONDIN: As I stated on a previous occasion, it was found that the Act of last session was not workable. This Bill proposes to amend that Act so as to authorize the maker or seller of the imitation article to label the article so as to make the public aware that it is an imitation. I will give the details of these amendments.

Section 29 (a) as appears in section 4 of chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes, 1914, entitled "An Act To Amend the Adulteration Act," is repealed. This repealed section provided that no article of food should be sold as maple sugar or maple syrup unless it was pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, and that every article which did not comply with the standard for maple sugar and maple syrup as provided by statute should be deemed to be adulterated,—that is to say, in case the article represented to be maple sugar or maple syrup was offered for sale and did not comply with the standard, then the vendor would have to prove that it was really pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup.

The second subsection of that section provided that the word "maple" should not be used on a label of any article or on a package containing it unless the article was pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, but, by a clerical error, the words "which is or" were inserted at the end of the fourth line of said subsection and had the effect of prohibiting the use of the word "maple" on the label of even pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup, thereby, in a certain sense, defeating the object of the Act.

The amendments provided in subsection 1 are, in effect: that any article of food which has the appearance of maple sugar or which is partly composed of maple sugar and maple syrup must bear a label containing the words "imitation maple