

engaged in the trade and with the inspectors, that these changes have been made. They are entirely satisfactory—in fact, desired and asked for by the trade—but the precise reason I am quite unable to give.

HON. MR. POWER—The same reason exists for striking out this rather complicated provision that existed for striking out the first clause of the Bill, because under the fifteenth section of the Act the Governor in Council may change or modify the classification. That is exactly what we are doing now; we are providing for a new classification of all pork, and why should we put that in the statute any more than the provision contained in the first clause? I think the better way would be to strike out this second clause, too.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend's suggestion is one that has a certain plausibility, and has been discussed, but this section does not confine itself to saying what shall be the classes, but makes the specific provision as to how the pork shall be cut up. It does not decide so much on the classification as on the mode in which the pork shall be packed, and it is thought desirable to put this in the Act, as it does not come literally under the clause my hon. friend has referred to, and it would be more extensively known and more easily referred to, and perhaps be past the possibility of any question of jurisdiction, which the other might not be.

HON. MR. POWER—There is one thing that strikes me about this clause. I do not know very much about the pork business, but there does not appear to be any provision for classifying such pork as is not cut up in the manner provided for in this clause.

HON. MR. DICKEY—That only applies to mess pork.

HON. MR. POWER—There does not appear to be any special reason why it should be cut up into pieces of that size, and it is not always so packed. There ought to be some way of classifying pork that is not cut up in that way.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—It is well understood that pork which does not come under that classification cannot be in-

spected. It is then what is called amongst lumbermen "cull" pork.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The Act as it stands is taken from the English law, and the classification as it stands includes all portions of the hog except the head and feet. I can see no good reason for this provision requiring the pork to be cut into pieces of from 4 to 6 lbs, except that it must be for parties camping in the woods, and can be conveniently dealt out to the different camps or to parties who wish to purchase in small quantities. It cannot be intended for house or ship use.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—That must be the reason.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Mess pork, which is generally used on board ship, is left as it is in the Act. The extra prime mess is for house use. While extra cuts of mess are the best pieces of the hog, prime mess is the next best, and prime may possibly be called the offal of the hog; so I can see no reason for this provision except the one I have suggested, that it is to accommodate those who work in the woods.

HON. MR. DICKEY—We have already cut out one clause of the Bill, and if we cut out another we may be open to the charge of cutting up the Bill.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The hon. leader of the House informs us that the trade is in favor of this Bill. I think that he must mean those who sell the pork, and not those who pack it.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved to amend the third clause by providing that the Act should only apply to pork submitted for inspection after the first day of September next.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—That is too soon, because a great deal of pork will be on hand then.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—We want to have this come into force in time for the new crop. There are parts of the country where pork is cured in September. The old pork would be inspected before that time.

The motion was agreed to.