

spectors, will be able to do that, and I propose before the Bill passes, to put in a clause authorizing any particular inspection under the Act to be done by a minister other than the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The last time we discussed this Bill the minister was good enough to delay its consideration for a week or ten days to give the canners of vegetables a greater opportunity to be heard. As the canners of meats are those most vitally interested or at any rate ought to feel more particularly the need of this legislation than anybody else, it will be interesting to know what the minister has heard in the interval from them in regard to this Bill. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) referred to a conversation that he had had at one time with a meat packer who thought that such a Bill would be of great use. One would think that if the Bill is going to be of very great use to canners, during the interval which has elapsed since the Bill has been printed, the minister would have heard from a great many canners urging that this Bill be adopted. It would be interesting to hear what they have to say.

Mr. FISHER. The only protest I have had against such a Bill was against the idea that seems to have got abroad that the date of the putting up of the goods was to be put on the package. The only other representation in regard to it was an earnest request from one packer that we should hurry it through as quickly as possible because he wanted to come under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister made the statement some time ago that it would be necessary to go abroad to obtain a man who would be capable of acting as inspector and of looking after the men who would be appointed to inspect the different establishments here. In what country does the minister expect to find such a man?

Mr. FISHER. I would certainly try to get a man from the old country—England or Scotland, if I have to go abroad at all—where there has been for a long time a very efficient local and municipal inspection of food products.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the inspection in these countries similar to that which you propose?

Mr. FISHER. Not exactly similar, but something like it.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that while this Bill may be in the interest of the canners, it has no concern for the general public in this country, and yet the minister tells us he intends to spend \$75,000 a year on its enforcement, and we have reason to believe that the annual cost will probably be \$150,000. I cannot see what the people

Mr. FISHER.

of Canada will get in return for that outlay. I believe that legislation along such lines, if it were proper legislation, would be of great advantage, but our first consideration ought to be to secure a wholesome food for our own people. As it is now, the inspection will only apply to food intended for export, whereas, in my opinion, it should include food intended for home trade as well. The result of this legislation will be that the product of the large factories will have the government stamp as a guarantee of the purity of the goods, and that the smaller factories, which are not so favoured, will be driven to the wall. Probably the proprietors of the small establishments have not had time to consider the position they will be placed in if this Bill should become law, and so I think it would be prudent for us to stay our hands. Another defect is that as the Bill now stands uninspected goods may still be sold abroad, though probably at a less price than the inspected goods may still be sold at home, in the interest of the trade of the country. We know that public confidence in canned goods has been shaken by the Chicago exposures, and that the consumers throughout the world are not using as much of that food as formerly, so that it becomes necessary to re-establish such products in the public favour. I believe that this law should be so framed that every product of our factories would bear the government stamp of inspection in order that pure food may be guaranteed the people of Canada as it is proposed to guarantee it to the people of foreign countries.

Mr. PORTER. It does appear to me that the qualification of the inspectors to be appointed is not sufficiently provided for. I asked the minister the other day what qualification would be required from these inspectors, and he referred me to section 17. I find that subsection 2 of that section provides that no person shall be appointed as a food inspector unless he has passed such examination as is deemed necessary by the Governor in Council. That provision has application only to veterinary inspectors, but the scope of the Bill contemplates the employment of others than veterinary inspectors, and section 17 says that the minister 'may' appoint inspectors and other officers to carry out the provisions of the Act.' As has been forcibly pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), a veterinary inspector is not the kind of official to pass judgment on factories where fruits and vegetables are canned. It comes back to the question which I asked originally: What will be the qualification of the inspectors whose duty it will be to pass upon fruit and vegetables? This is a most important matter. Under the general provisions of this Bill your inspector has power to condemn the article he inspects, and to arrest persons in whose possession he finds