

Observance Bill, the Factory Bill and this Bill. It seems to me they all involve the same principle. It seems to me this is a matter relating to property and civil rights. You propose to establish certain police regulations; it is the manner in which the property shall be held, owned and disposed of. You have no more right to interfere with a sale of property of this sort, personal property, than with the sale and disposal of land or horses. Fraud, so far as fraud is liable to be committed, is to be prevented, but that is a part of the business of the Local Legislatures, in these matters; they are authorised, under our constitution, to make such penal regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of their own laws. The penalty attached to the placing of a label falsely representing the weights or contents of a package is a police regulation. It is no portion of the criminal law. It is for the purpose of regulating the transfer of property of a certain kind from one party to another. It is an attempt to protect one party from fraud on the part of another, and a proposition to punish the guilty party for that offence. It is simply a police regulation, and it seems to me that it is not within the jurisdiction of this House, but clearly within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. Why does the hon. gentleman mix up food and fertilisers in the same Act?

Mr. McLELAN. Fertilisers are used to produce food.

Mr. BLAKE. A great many things are used to produce food.

Mr. McLELAN. We have to manufacture fertilisers and analyse them, and provide that farmers may not be robbed through the purchase of adulterated fertilisers.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting to the principle of the Bill, but I object to mixing up my food with manure.

Mr. McLELAN. There is a connection between the two.

Mr. BLAKE. There are a great many things which are connected with one another in one sense, cause and effect and so forth, which, however, you do not mix together. The hon. gentleman can catch one of the most delicate fishes in the world, the brook trout, with a worm; he eats the trout and rejects the worm. Under these circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman has given any ground why we should mix up in the same Bill food and fertilisers. I do not think it is an instance of cleanly legislation.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like the hon. member to state wherein lies the necessity for this Bill. I understand it is subsidiary to the Bill passed last Session, and, so far as I have been able to compare them, the difference is very slight.

Mr. McLELAN. There are several minor differences which are shown in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the principle upon which the definition of agricultural fertilisers is based.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know that there are any particular principles involved. The definition is taken in general terms from the Bill introduced by Mr. Ferguson, of Welland, respecting agricultural fertilisers.

Mr. BLAKE. It is very satisfactory to know that the hon. gentleman has adopted the definition of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) of the term "agricultural fertiliser," but I think it would be still more satisfactory if

the hon. gentleman would explain the grounds upon which that definition is adopted. It is very important to the general public that there should be a proper definition of agricultural fertilisers, and I think we ought to have some other assurance that this definition is correct, than that of the hon. member for Welland; we ought to have the assurance of the Government who is bringing forward this Bill as to the accuracy of the definition.

Mr. McLELAN. The definition has been submitted to the chief analyst and approved of by him as embracing all that is necessary to have placed in the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. In comparing these two Acts I find the definition is not the same. The definition in the Act now under consideration is that the word includes every substance composed of fertilising manure which is sold at more than \$12 per ton, and which contains ammonia or its equivalent of nitrogen.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is twelve instead of ten in the amendment.

Mr. FISHER. It also includes potash instead of only ammonia or its equivalent of nitrogen or phosphoric acid.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The word "twelve" will be changed for ten, and the word "potash" will be taken away.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I understand the definition of the hon. member for Welland is not accepted in its entirety as infallible.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Bill of the hon. member for Welland has been accepted by the Government and there will be some amendments made to it.

Mr. BLAKE. When I asked the Minister to explain the ground of this definition he told me it was the definition of the Bill of the hon. member for Welland. Then I pointed out that it would be more satisfactory if we had some additional ground for that definition, and the hon. gentleman answered that it had been concurred in by the chief analyst. Now, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) points out that the definition in the Bill of the hon. member for Welland, although accepted by the Government, differs from the definition as contained in this Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, it does not.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, it does.

Mr. McLELAN. It differs as to the value.

Mr. BLAKE. It differs as to the ingredients, too.

Mr. McLELAN. As to only one.

Mr. BLAKE. Now we are told that these definitions are the same, and to have that persisted in, after the hon. member for Brome has read the clause, seems to me a little too much. The definition which the hon. gentleman says is the same is not a definition which declares that a fertiliser, to come within the Act, shall be sold at more than \$12 a ton, when the definition in the Government Bill as to value is \$10 a ton. The definition in the Act includes all fertilisers containing ammonia, or its equivalent of nitrogen, or potash, or phosphoric acid, and potash is left out altogether in this definition. These definitions therefore are not the same.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is so in the Bill of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said there would be an amendment to the Bill of the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is what I mean. It is not necessary to split hairs on so small a matter. The Bill of the Government will be amended in this respect and that is all. In respect to value we put ten in the place of twelve and take out the word "potash." When I passed the draft of the Bill about the adulteration of food to my hon. friend