

lands were left to themselves, they would be unproductive and perhaps abandoned. Now, out of those 55,000 sugar-makers, I am informed that a bare thousand are able to manufacture a first-class product; that is due to the lack of modern methods, with which they have not yet been made sufficiently acquainted.

Mr. Speaker, I have given a brief outline only of the possibilities of our national industry. National it is indeed, because it is carried on almost exclusively in our own country, and the north-eastern American states. All countries in the world grow cereals and raise domestic cattle for consumption, but Canada has a monopoly of the manufacture of maple syrup and sugar. And if the Dominion Government and the provincial legislatures concerned take the least care to promote that industry, the Dominion Government, by practical and even radical enactments, and the local governments by the diffusion of theoretical knowledge, wonderful results may be expected in the near future.

The Bill now before the House is opportune and again I congratulate the minister. The new proposals are for the present embodied in a general Act, but let us look forward to a not far distant time when the sugar industry will have in the statute-books its own special and more elaborate legislation. I am afraid, however, that section 29 of this Bill is not framed to provide for producers and consumers the protection that it is expected to give against adulteration. As it now reads, subsection 1 of section 29 stipulates this:

Section 29A of the Act respecting Adulterations, being chapter 133 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as enacted by chapter 19 of the statutes of 1914, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

29A. No person will keep for sale, offer or expose for sale, or sell any article of food resembling or being an imitation of maple sugar or maple syrup, or which is composed partly of maple sugar or maple syrup and which is not pure maple sugar or pure maple syrup unless the said article or the package containing the said article is labelled with the words "imitation of maple sugar" or "imitation of maple syrup" or "compound maple sugar" or "compound maple syrup," as the case may be, in a conspicuous place upon the said article or upon the said package and in large letters easily seen, of a different colour from the label or other letters which appear on the label; the said letters to be at least one-quarter of an inch in height, printed on the same line and entirely separate from all other inscription on the label.

That subsection, it is true, takes away from adulterators the privilege enjoyed by

them to this day of selling as pure a product which was not pure in the least. It obliges them, it is true, to label their goods, and declare that their product is not pure. But the Bill does not go so far as to provide that they will have to state to what extent the sugar or syrup offered for sale is not pure; and they will still enjoy a dangerous measure of impunity. Elsewhere, however, the Bill requires of the actual producers of the pure article that their products will come up to the standard fixed by the regulations of the Department of Inland Revenue. If a standard has been set for sugar and syrup that will be sold as pure and labelled as such, how shall it be known to what extent the articles labelled "imitation of maple syrup" or "compound maple sugar" are offensive or inoffensive. Those who prepare the adulterated article will not be to blame, except in extreme cases, because they will be authorized by law to sell the adulterated product, provided they put on the required label. That is a door open to adulterators, who are not even now over-scrupulous. The last part of subsection 1 of section 29 puts a serious handicap on the unfortunate producer of the pure article and endangers the whole industry. If the Bill were to be adopted as it now reads, it is my opinion and that of competent persons with whom I discussed the matter at length, that it would destroy all that has been done for that industry heretofore, and the total output would continue to decline, as I have shown it to have done by quoting statistics since 1850.

Now, why allow adulterators to set up such a competition so hurtful to honest producers. Such a competition is to a certainty bound to bring about the collapse of the maple sugar and syrup industry. Why also should we make it easy for consumers to buy a syrup made up of 99 per cent ordinary sugar and 1 per cent maple product and be deceived into the belief that he is buying a maple product in whole or in part.

It may be asked how the competition of the adulterated article may be so disastrous to the producers. The question is as easily answered as put. A farmer, for instance, sells his pure maple syrup, say \$1 a gallon. Now if a merchant buys a gallon and makes five or ten gallons out of it, which he then retails at the same price as the farmer; is not such a competition ruinous for the farmer? And, on the other hand, is it not an out-and-out theft from