

Mr. BLAKE. And what is the rate or proportion to be?

Mr. SPROULE. If the Government authorises a certain proportion, it would be easy for the analyst to determine whether the proportion is there or not.

Mr. BLAKE. This Bill makes no provision as to the percentage of oil which should remain, and the other Bill is about fertilisers and not food, and we must not mix them up too much.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The deterioration in the quality of the oil cake is largely due to the fact that recently very much improved methods have been discovered of extracting the oil from linseed, and of course the oil cake depreciates more in quality. And the more successful the manufacturer is in extracting the oil, the more inferior will be the quality of the refuse.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will find that section 19 fixes the limit as to the amount of oil it shall contain.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, as that applies only to compounds in which it may not be possible to be accurate in the ingredients to the last fraction, and therefore a certain limit of variability is fixed. It would not apply in a case of refuse upon the manufacture of linseed oil.

Mr. SPROULE. These cattle foods contain so much of different ingredients, such as corn meal, linseed cake, and so on. Now, if they contain too much of that which is comparatively useless and not enough of the more valuable ingredients, the quantities could be determined, and a percentage of oil could be ascertained as well.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not discussing anything but this question of oil cake, which, as I understand, is the refuse which is left in the operation of extracting the linseed oil, and what the manufacturer does is to extract as much oil as he can out of it. That is his trade, and what is left is sold to the farmers, and you are not going to pass a law that the manufacturer must not take as much oil out as he can. The farmer must know in this particular case that he gets only what the manufacturer is unable to extract, and if the methods of extraction are more perfect, the less oil is left.

Mr. FISHER. The same is true with reference to the refuse from flour. Some years ago bran was of great value as cattle food; but in consequence of the new process of extracting flour, what is left now is of very little value. I think, however, that adulteration by the introduction of buckwheat hulls, or other matter of that kind, could be provided against; but I cannot see how you can limit the quantity of oil to be extracted from the linseed.

Mr. McLELAN. In the case of adulterating these mixtures by buckwheat hulls, plaster of Paris, and other matters of that kind, the provision would apply.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong, when he assumes that there is only the amount of oil left which cannot be extracted. It can be bought of different qualities, by paying different prices; and the question for the analyst would be, whether the percentage is present that is represented.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). What is known technically as cattle food, is a different preparation altogether from what is called oil cake, and I think it is in the case of those foods that the Bill will be valuable. There has been a great tendency of late years to use condiments or mixtures containing more or less stimulating ingredients, and these are fed in limited quantities along with other food, in fattening stock. These are capable of very much adultera-

tion, because they are compounded with certain drugs which have a chemical effect on the cattle, and are much more valuable than the coarser ingredients of linseed cake, and other cheaper articles which give it bulk. While of course, the manufacturer will extract all the oil he can out of the linseed, there is no doubt the refuse can be made much less valuable by mixing inferior ingredients with it, and perhaps that kind of adulteration might be looked after.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated that this has been amended by the omission of that part which prescribes an intimation as to the component parts of the admixture. The trade objected to that, on the score that it involved the revealing of trade secrets, and it was deemed enough to say mixture. We know that a very large portion of these articles are mixtures under any circumstances, and the mere statement as to that class of them which are confessedly mixtures, that they are mixtures, would not reveal the existence of the evil which the Minister desires to avoid. Of course, when an article professes to be some one thing and not a mixture, then the announcement in a conspicuous place that it is a mixture, ought to indicate that it is an adulteration of some kind. I would like also to know whether the legislation we passed last year to require the statement of the component parts of an article was based on any precedent, or was original with ourselves.

Mr. McLELAN. Last year's legislation was our own; this year's legislation is founded on the English system.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the tariff of 1 per cent. been obtained from other legislation, or is it wholly experimental?

Mr. McLELAN. That is the percentage in the American Act on the same subject.

On section 3,

Mr. CASEY. With regard to persons appointed as analysts, I think there should be some limitation to persons possessing a medical degree or some degree in chemistry.

Mr. McLELAN. This is a re-enactment of the old Act.

Mr. CASEY. Whether it is new or old, I think some certificate should be required as to the analyst's knowledge of chemistry.

Mr. McLELAN. The clause provides that they must be persons possessing competent medical, chemical and microscopical knowledge, and that is only ascertained by the certificate they bear.

Mr. CASEY. That leaves the Minister to determine their competency.

Mr. FISHER. Is there any limit or guide as to the number of these analysts who may be appointed? If there is no such limit, I would like the hon. Minister to give us some information.

Mr. McLELAN. The number appointed is only limited by the wants of trade. They are provided in most of the commercial centres where business demands them.

Mr. CASEY. There is no limit in the Bill, but the Minister must surely know how many he intends to appoint.

Mr. McLELAN. There are eight now. It is not proposed at present to increase the number.

On section 6,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the Minister if he is aware whether any of the municipalities have availed themselves of the provisions of this statute and appointed an inspector.

Mr. McLELAN. None of them have taken action yet. But the matter has been discussed in several of them and is likely to be carried into effect.