

showing his whole scheme, and how it will balance the account. We know that a good deal of noise takes place when fees are raised, and quite lately the hon. gentleman has been beset by deputations asking that the canal tolls should be lowered. The same thing may happen if he proposes to raise these other fees.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think it would be wise to put in the Bill any scheme of fees. It would be better to leave that in the hands of the Governor in Council to arrange as the requirements of the service demands.

Mr. BLAKE. I think so far as the public revenue is concerned it would be well that he should provide that these annuities should be provided out of the fees, and not made a charge on the consolidated revenue. In this way the accounts would have to be stated in a more thorough manner than has yet been done.

Mr. McLELAN. There is one difficulty connected with that, and that is, that though the account may not balance in a particular year, owing to the state of the trade, if two years were taken it might balance.

Mr. MILLS. What we are entitled to expect at the hands of the Government is a general statement, showing what amount has been received in fees, what the diminution has been, taking a series of years, and what is the probable amount of fees received under existing charges. We have had no estimate upon which an intelligent action can be taken.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us a statement of the expenditures for 1878, 1879 and 1880.

Mr. McLELAN. In 1878 the expenditure was \$49,940, in 1879, \$44,670, and in 1880, \$44,652.

Mr. VAIL. I understood the Minister to say that there are 47 cullers now employed.

Mr. McLELAN. Not quite 47. There will be a reduction in number.

Mr. BLAKE. The deficiency since 1879 has been about \$65,000 as well as I can make it out. Can the hon. gentleman say how the account stands to-day, whether we are on the wrong side of the balance sheet or not?

Mr. McLELAN. We are on the wrong side. In 1879, we had a surplus of \$50,000, which has gradually gone down until it is exhausted.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite clear that there must be a deficiency of \$10,000 or \$15,000 now. In 1884 the deficiency was about \$11,000, so that it really becomes a serious matter. If the practical result of the hon. gentleman's change is a reduction in the expenditure, that would be so far satisfactory; but I think the state of things which has resulted in a chronic deficiency since the year 1879 is a state of things which renders it absolutely essential that he should give us some forecast of what the ultimate charges are to be. The hon. gentleman knows how long annuitants live, and I am afraid his experiments will hardly be satisfactory. I trust that at the next stage of the measure the hon. gentleman will be prepared to give us some fuller information as to how this scheme of his can be entertained without any serious loss or liability on the part of the public. The danger of making such an arrangement as has been made is pretty well demonstrated by the figures before us, and if we make a readjustment we should see that it is such as will lead in the future to the results which the hon. gentleman has depicted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister what are the fees of culling staves and deals per hundred now in force.

Mr. BLAKE

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the scale of fees here. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Committee rose and reported resolution.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 122) respecting Agricultural Fertilisers. He said: I think it would be better to ask the House to go into committee before giving explanations, because the Bill is composed of so many little details that it might be more convenient to discuss it in committee. I will explain, however, that the Bill has for its object that every manufacturer and every importer of fertilisers—and by the word "fertilisers" all kinds of agricultural manure are not included, but only fertilisers which I think would be better called in this, as well as in the Act which the House has examined this afternoon, by the appellation of commercial fertilisers, that is to say fertilisers that are in trade—shall transmit to the Minister of Inland Revenue at a certain period of the year, and we say the month of January, and before offering for sale, a sample of such fertiliser, the quantity being 2 lbs., so as to be preserved in the Department for the purpose of comparison with any other sample that might afterwards be transmitted to the Department for comparison and for the different objects of the Bill. That transmission is to be made with an affidavit of the manufacturer or importer stating that the sample which he transmits to the Department is a fair sample of the article manufactured or sold. The second object of the Bill is that no commercial fertiliser be offered for sale unless a certificate of analysis of the same be openly and publicly printed or stamped or labelled on the package or bag or barrel, containing the said fertiliser, and, if the fertiliser is in bulk, that the certificate of analysis of the manufacturer be also delivered with the article when sold or offered for sale. You will see by this that the object at first is not to enforce an inspection, but to guarantee the public that the article which will be sold will be an article of which a sample is preserved under the custody of the authorities, and that the article sold is sold with that certificate testifying to the quality of the article, the correctness of which may always be decided by the analysts of the Department to which it belongs. The Bill goes further and says that, if the manufacturer or the importer or the retailer wishes to have a certificate of inspection from the inspector, he may have it, and then the inspector will attach to the package or the other covering of the fertiliser, not a certificate, but what is called the inspector's tag, that is, a label saying that the fertiliser has been submitted to inspection. That inspection, I must say, does not mean that what the inspector shall deliver on the label given by him will be another certificate of analysis by the Department, but only that the inspector has seen that the fertiliser sold contains, according to the analysis of the fertiliser, a certain quantity of ingredients which are presumed to be necessary to constitute a fertiliser under the terms of the Act, that is, a fertiliser at least of the commercial value of \$10 a ton. The inspector shall not furnish that tag or label, or certify an inspection, unless the article he inspects is presumed to contain the quantity of ingredients which are mentioned in clause 11 of the Bill. Clause 12 mentions the penalties that will be imposed upon parties guilty of the following offences: First, offering for sale an article—and we must not forget that it is a fertiliser of a certain value, because the law does not want to prevent the importation of an article of lower value, bringing it nearer to the standard of ordinary manure—offering for sale any fertiliser unless every provision of the Act has been complied with, unless the article which is sold contains the ingredients which are mentioned in these certificates of analysis which the vendor is obliged to give to the purchaser, and that if the seller has asked for an inspector's certificate, the inspector's