

conditions and of the cleanliness which should exist. One of the chief objections to the conditions in Chicago were that the employees were aliens who were accustomed to surroundings which did not impress on them the necessity for cleanliness in their work. We might expect to find and we did find excellent conditions prevailing in our meat packing factories.

Mr. FOSTER. And you are going to permanently inspect only the meat packing houses?

Mr. FISHER. That is all. It was the uproar occasioned in Chicago which caused the inspection, and I gave the inspector no instructions to inspect other canning factories although as a matter of fact he did make some casual visits to them.

Mr. FOSTER. I may be wrong, I am not a specialist and have not travelled over the country, but I think the minister has made out a pretty strong case for leaving the Canadian meat packing business alone. This legislation would probably not have been brought about now were it not for the 'Jungle-book' and the row in the United States. It is sometimes necessary for us to follow the general lines of the legislation passed in other countries circumstanced as we are, but the conditions of the meat packing industry in the United States and the conditions in Canada are so absolutely different that they cannot require similar treatment. The only argument the minister uses is that it might injure our export meat trade if Canadian meat products went into the market unmarked and uninspected to compete with meats from another country which bear the government inspection stamp. I think the reputation of our Canadian meat products has been pretty well established in Great Britain at all events, and in view of the good name which our meat packers have made for themselves I doubt whether the exposures in the United States would have any deleterious effect upon our export business to the United Kingdom. After all it is the quality of the products which in the end will secure a permanent demand for them. I think the minister might well lay the report on the table, erasing from it these details which he has referred to, which nobody would wish him to bring down, and which do not concern the information the House wants to get at. The minister says that no fault was to be found with the larger establishments, and that with regard to the smaller houses the fault was only in minor details. But these smaller houses would in the main not come under the inspection at all, and no good to them would be accomplished by this measure. The minister qualified his statement by saying that even in the smaller houses there was only what might be called a slight lack of perfection. Well, if in the large houses there was no fault at all to be found and if in the small concerns there was

Mr. FISHER.

only a slight lack of perfection, that would go to show that the meat packing industry of Canada is on an excellent foundation.

Then, the two statements that were made show the utter disparity between the United States packing houses and ours. Climate has a good deal to do with it. Our conditions with regard to climate, water and the like of that are very different from those of Chicago, Kansas City and other packing house centres. Then, the employees of our packing houses, as the minister says, are clean Canadians, with some idea of the necessity of clean appliances and sanitary conditions, and are poles apart from the rather mixed people engaged in that business in the United States, whether they be Galicians or Poles or any other class from the old country. That would make all the stronger in my mind the doubt as to whether it was necessary to undertake this legislation at this time. You are undertaking legislation which, in one way or another, if it is effective, will, I think, act to the detriment of those packing houses which are not inspected as not having any part in the export trade. If the minister intends to cut that out, the Bill will be more definite, but he does not. He refers that from the enactment of a Bill to the judgment of a council, and the same difficulty will take place in the council making the selection as in our making it and putting it in the Bill. In the end the council will have to make an inspection of most of the meat-packing establishments in Canada. Then, again, to carry this out you have to load this country with a very considerable initial expense, amounting in round numbers to about \$70,000, with the minister's moderate calculation of forty or fewer establishments. To my mind the number is likely to grow greater rather than less. Only experience can tell us whether that will be so or not. With all these considerations taken into account, suppose you still decide that this inspection is necessary, is there no way by which, with co-operation between the Dominion and the provincial authorities, an inspection of meat and other food products can be carried on without a duplication of expenditure? The municipalities, with their health officers and the provinces with their appointments and laws and regulations looking in the same direction, are all doing in part what the minister proposes to do here. If duplication can be avoided it ought to be; if co-operation can be had, it ought to be had. Then, you are looking after an infinitesimal part of the meat production of the country, to see that it is inspected and up to the standard, while you are leaving out of notice that large proportion of the meat production which is consumed in the country by our own citizens, and which ought to be as pure and good as the meat we send out to foreign populations.