

he said it must necessarily be read in connection with the Bill which the Government have before the House. Then the hon. member, a little prematurely, asked what was the definition of fertiliser, and he was answered that the definition was the same as the definition in the Government Bill, but I forgot to say that the measure of the Government will be amended by changing the value from twelve to ten, and by taking out the word "potash." I may here mention that fertiliser in the Bill will not include all fertilisers sold. It is intended to ask that all those who want to have a certificate of inspection of commercial fertilisers will be obliged to give to the inspector of the Government a certificate of the manufacturer stating the ingredients of the fertiliser, and those ingredients will have to be of a certain quantity and value, otherwise that fertiliser will not be considered as a commercial fertiliser. Other fertilisers of the same quality might be sold, but not inspected. The Government does not intend to render inspection absolutely necessary, but those commercial fertilisers that will be sold as inspected will have to be of the grade and value mentioned.

Mr. FISHER. The necessity of having a preliminary discussion of the Bill before going into committee is evident. The Minister gave us an explanation which was erroneous. After some difficulty we have obtained an explanation which we can understand from the Secretary of State as regards this particular clause.

Mr. DAVIES. The Adulteration of Food Act was passed last year, and it extended simply to the food and drink of man. This year it is proposed to extend it to the food and drink of cattle as well. Has there been any information obtained by the Minister to lead him to make the change, or is it a mere experiment?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know that there have been any special representations; but a study of the general question led us to the conclusion that it is desirable to guard against fraud with respect to cattle food.

Mr. DAVIES. Has it been brought to the attention of the Department that cattle food is largely adulterated, or is it proposed to take action to provide against adulteration?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been very frequently stated by parties that cattle food is adulterated; but I do not think any analyses have been made.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any representations been received from authorised bodies, such as agricultural societies, which take an interest in these very essential and important matters; or have representations been received from analysts, because it is possible they might desire to enlarge the scope of their investigations?

Mr. McLELAN. I am informed that agricultural societies do not usually take cognisance of such a matter as this, and that they do not deal with such matters. At all events, we have not had any representation from any agricultural society.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it from the analysts?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman knows that for years both agriculturists and every person interested in this important branch of industry have been complaining of two things. First, that a great deal of the commercial or artificial fertilisers—

Mr. BLAKE. We are not talking about fertilisers but about food.

Mr. SPROULE. As one engaged in the selling of cattle I know that complaints are frequently made with respect to cattle food. Take oil cake; it is not what it purports to be, and much of it is practically worthless. In my county farmers constantly complain in regard to it, and many have abandoned the use of such foods, finding them of no value.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. DAVIES. The only question is whether it is adulterated food.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the oil cake, it often happens that the oil has been first abstracted through a process of heat and pressure; and this is sold as pure oil-cake when in reality it is only refuse.

Mr. FARROW. This is a subject of considerable importance to agriculturists. I have had a good deal of experience and have heard many suggestions in regard to it. These suggestions have come from practical agriculturists. They have also come from agricultural societies, both township and county. Our experience in this line is this: We have been using a great many of these foods, such as oil cake and cattle food, and we think they have not been doing the good to our stock that the vendors said they would do. There is a suspicion in the minds of agriculturists—I know it is so in my section of country—that they contain some worthless ingredients, and are not up to the mark. Farmers think it would be a very good thing if the Government would provide proper machinery to have those foods tested, so that a proper article shall be supplied, for which very high prices are charged. There is a large industry of this class at Mitchell—I do not say they are turning out an inferior article—and a great many use the food. We have established a great many milk factories throughout our neighborhood. We have an establishment which manufactures over 100 tons of cheese a year. When the milk is carried to the factory the calves have to be fed on different foods, and we use oil cake and the foods mentioned in this Bill. We want to be sure we are buying a good article. That is the kernel of the whole thing. We, being simple agriculturists, cannot test these foods, and we want the Government to see that there is no fraud practised on the farmers. If this Bill will cover the point, the Government will be doing a wise thing.

Mr. BLAKE. I was quite sure that the Minister was wrong when he said this was not a subject with which agricultural societies as a general rule interfered.

Mr. McLELAN. I said they had not taken it up in any communication to the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said more than that. He said that agricultural societies did not generally deal with such matters. This matter is so vitally connected with agricultural operations, particularly in the Province of Ontario and in some of the other Provinces, I was quite sure those associations would have dealt with the subject if there was a grievance. My own information, derived from the newspapers, is that occasionally cattle foods are sold which do not contain quite so much nutritious element as they should do. With respect to the particular case of oil cake: it may be perhaps a little difficult to ascertain the precise line at which there may be said to be an absence of the nutritious element. Oil cake is the refuse after the oil for commercial purposes has been extracted. Complaints have been made that too much oil is taken out of the oil cake. And there is but little oil left in it. Whether it will be easy to draw the line in that regard, and determine whether enough oil has been left in the cake or not, I am afraid I cannot say, and I am afraid it will puzzle the analyst to determine. Of course, when you put in something else, which is either noxious or not useful and adds to the bulk, that is a different thing.

Mr. SPROULE. If the manufacturer is to take out a certain quantity of oil and no more, then it would be an easy matter for the analyst to determine whether there is the proper proportion.

Mr. BLAKE. Who is to decide?

Mr. SPROULE. The analyst, of course.