

certificate must be guaranteed by the certificate of analysis, and that the person giving to the inspector the certificate of analysis, whereas the article sold would not have the quantity of ingredients required, will also be exposed to a fine. The other clauses are for those who might force certificates or labels or tags, or who might apply to one quality of fertiliser the certificate belonging to another quality. In a word, the Act is limited to this: First the manufacturer or importer shall be obliged to transmit a sample of his merchandise to the Department of Inland Revenue, there to be submitted to analysis; the party selling a fertiliser is obliged to guarantee to the public purchasing the product that he sells, by a certificate of analysis that must be attached to the packages sold or given, when it is in bulk, that he must sell an article equivalent in quality to the certificate of analysis he is obliged to give; and, secondly, when anyone has put in trade an article which has been inspected, he may require from an inspector his certificate, and those not complying with the provisions of the law, or complying with it apparently but not really, will be subjected to the penalties mentioned in the Act.

Mr. FISHER. Before this Bill goes into committee, I would like to say a word or two about it. I think the Secretary of State is quite right in saying that the details of the Bill are such it would be better to discuss it in committee than on the second reading. At the same time, there are one or two things I would like to refer to. I think this Bill and that which we have discussed this afternoon with regard to the adulteration of food, drugs and agricultural fertilisers are so intimately connected that it is a good thing they have come up on the same day and can be so closely compared. There are some parts of this Bill which I think are unnecessary, in view of the provisions contained in the Bill discussed this afternoon with regard to the penalties to which the Secretary of State has alluded. I find that the penalties under the two Bills, although they apply to the same offence, are not exactly the same, and I do not see why in one a different penalty should be attached to an action than that which is attached to the same action in the other. The Secretary of State has explained that the inspector shall obtain a certificate from the manufacturer, informing him, and supposed to inform the public through him, of what are the constituents of the agricultural fertilisers which are inspected, the inspector is then required to affix his tag to the package or sample, and it is supposed thereby he is adding to the information concerning that sample or package, but I find no provision in the Bill which insists upon the inspector obtaining an analysis of the article. I do not therefore see that there is any great advantage to be had in attaching this tag by the inspector. He is simply acting on the information supplied him by the manufacturer or dealer, and is obtaining no other information of his own. It seems to me therefore that this attachment of the tag of the inspector is really adding a fictitious value to the goods, and is perhaps assisting in a fraud more than guarding against a fraud. If in addition to the certificate of the analyst, which must be supplied by the manufacturer, the inspector himself were required to analyse the sample, his certificate or tag would be given a very great additional authority, but, under the present system, I do not see that it is any gain at all to the purchaser. I think, therefore, unless some provision to this effect is inserted, the provision of the Act in regard to adulteration of food and agricultural fertilisers, by which the vendor is obliged to put upon record a statement of the ingredients and the standard to which the article comes up, would be quite sufficient, and just such as much as is really done in this Bill. Merely drawing the attention of the Secretary of State and the House to these points, which are general in their scope,

I will allow the motion to proceed and discuss the details of the Bill in committee.

Mr. LANGELIER. I approve entirely of the principle embodied in this Bill, which, if I remember aright, is the Bill that was suggested by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) some months ago, but I am afraid the 3rd clause of the Bill will not obtain the object in view, that of securing the sale of fertilisers of the proper strength. I am speaking from something which came under my notice when I was Commissioner of Crown Lands for Quebec. At that time there was a great, I might call it, fever for the manufacture of phosphates. Some very rich mines of phosphate had been found in the townships of Templeton, Portland, Wakefield, and some other townships in the Ottawa Valley. Our exporters of phosphate came to me and asked whether it could not be possible to have an inspection of the phosphate before it was exported, and the reason they gave was that they were being defrauded in England to a large extent. From the information they gave me this was the way they were defrauded at that time, and I suppose the same thing has gone on since. The phosphate was sold here at so much a ton, according to the amount of phosphorous or other fertilising substance it contained, but the phosphate sent to England, sold on those terms, was analysed. It was referred for analysis to a chemist, who was generally quite a scientific man, but of course he only tested the sample which was delivered to him. According to the test those phosphate manufacturers in Canada made here before exporting, the exported phosphate should have given say 80 or 90 per cent. of phosphorous, but the samples analysed in England were found to contain only 50 or 60 per cent. They thought at first there was ignorance or dishonesty on the part of the English analysts, but at last it was discovered that the English purchaser took the precaution to select the very worst samples, and submitted them to the analysts. In every lot of phosphate there are some lumps of inferior description, which would give 40 or 50 per cent. only of phosphorous, whereas the whole lot might contain an average of at least 80 or 85 per cent. The result of the whole lot being averaged on these inferior samples submitted to the analyst was that our exporters were defrauded to such an extent that they said it was perfectly impossible for them to compete with exporters from other countries, for instance Spain, unless an inspection was made by the Local Government in this country before the ore was actually exported to England.

Now, in section 3 of this Bill, the same danger is to be feared on the part of our exporters which has been realised in an inverse manner on the part of the foreign purchaser. The section provides that every manufacturer or importer of fertilisers for sale shall transmit to the Minister of Inland Revenue, each year, a fair average sample of the fertiliser manufactured or imported by him. Well, it is left to the manufacturer himself to determine the quality of the sample to be inspected. If in England the importer has been able to defraud our exporters by selecting the very worst sample, it will be very easy for our manufacturers—I do not say they will be dishonest enough to perjure themselves—but there will be great temptation to them to select a sample which will certainly be above the average. Averages are always very dangerous. I am afraid we will not obtain an average oath from the manufacturer, or an oath which will go very much above the average.

The best plan would be to have those phosphates inspected under the same rules which govern the inspection of other articles. I do not say that inspection should be compulsory, but provision should be made that whenever a purchaser of phosphates or of any other fertiliser desires it to be inspected, the inspection should be made by a Government officer,