

of the chickens and the feed, saying nothing about anything else, leaves a small balance on the right side. I have read an account of the expenses at Glengarry, and there is not a dollar included for this instruction work. The officer went down there two or three times a week to supervise the work, but there is no charge of that kind in the account that I read; still it showed a big deficiency. The minister makes a statement to this House which the Auditor General's Report contradicts. Take up the account of Mr. Thomas Sainsburg, of Chatham:

Thomas Sainsburg, Chatham, Ont.: Services, \$85; 398 chickens, \$107.90; milk, 4,105 pounds at 25c. per cwt.; tallow, 60 pounds at 6c.; sawdust, \$1; freight charges, \$11.62; rent of scales, \$4; horse hire, \$1; cartage, 50c.; sundries, 59c.; dressing and selling chickens, 50c.; paid to pickers, \$27.36.

Now, Mr. Sainsburg may have been a farmer, and there is not an item there that any farmer would not have to pay for in the chicken business. There is nothing there for experimental work or instruction to the farmer. The chickens were shipped and sold, and there is \$16 return, leaving a deficiency of \$237. Now, did these chickens die? There is the published statement of the hon. gentleman. I simply read the items that he furnishes the department of the Auditor General, including the expenditure for chickens and their feed, boxes to ship them in, and freight, that any other farmer would have to pay. Besides, he allowed his political friends where he established the station, some pay for looking after them. But the experimental work was done by the department the same as in Glengarry. At Bondville, Que., there was a loss of \$239; at Charlottetown, a loss of \$405; at Sussex, N.B., a loss of \$198, and at Chatham, of \$237; and so it goes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to establish more of these fattening stations the coming year, and at what points?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We will have more stations going on this year, I cannot say yet the exact points, and some will be continued where they are.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the minister made up his mind which ones will be continued, whether it will be the most successful or the least successful?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think they have all been so successful as to justify me in continuing them.

Mr. KAULBACH. As the discussion has been carried on with respect to chickens and cheese, I would ask the minister if he has given any attention to the supervision of the milk carried to the factories, so as to secure its being of a proper quality? It needs a good quality of milk to make a good cheese for export. Has he taken

Mr. TAYLOR.

pains to see that none of the ingredients of the milk have been extracted? And could not the distance from the centres where cheese are manufactured be widened considerably by the use of proper carriages?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course the milk requires to be in good condition. I am glad to say that in Canada there is practically no skim milk cheese made, nor is there any skimming of the milk at the factories. That matter has been thoroughly gone into by our dairy officers. We have our inspectors, and the cheesemakers themselves look after the quality of the milk.

Mr. KAULBACH. Would not the milk suffer from being drawn a long distance to the factory?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The milk will be drawn to the factory in the future as it has been in the past. It does sometimes suffer from being carried too long a distance.

Mr. KAULBACH. Are the manufacturers confined to certain weights of cheese for shipment, or can they make a cheese of any weight they please?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They can make it of any weight.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister did not give me information in reference to the great discrepancy in the case at Chatham, where there was a deficiency of \$237.63.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot explain those figures. No doubt a full explanation can be made in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman get it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have given a full statement of the expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister says that with the exception of the station at Lancaster all the others paid a profit. Now, the chickens that were sold from this station brought \$16.09, and he paid out \$253.72 to Mr. Sainsburg. A cyclone must have struck those chickens up there. That is worse than a disease.

Mr. KAULBACH. As to the milk, I understood the hon. minister to state that a certain test is required. What is that test?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that I said anything particularly about that. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is alluding to the ordinary working of cheese factories or not. There is no change in the method of handling milk in the cheese factory. That system has been pursued for many years. It