

amount of the adulteration—the amount of the harmless foreign article which is included in it.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the point would be covered by stipulating that the person selling any of these mixtures should state on each package in what proportion the different ingredients are there.

Mr. WELLS. Suppose they are not in packages?

Mr. CASEY. Of course there would be some difficulty then.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think that it would be possible to carry out that idea without a great deal of trouble and expense to the dealer, in the way of stamping standards and so on. I think it would be better that such articles should be declared exempt from the Act unless they are labelled mixtures.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That would render the whole clause valueless.

Mr. CASEY. The whole Bill proceeds on the principle that the purchaser has a right to know what he is buying, and if he has that right with regard to simple substances, he surely has the same right to know the ingredients of mixtures. Now, a great majority of the articles sold are mixtures of non-hurtful substances—there are different grades of tea, coffee, and so on. I do not see any difficulty in providing that each package of a mixture should be labelled with a statement of the proportion in which the different articles enter into it. For instance, a pound of 20c. coffee mixture might be labelled three parts coffee, one part chicory. I think one-fourth or one-fifth would be a low enough standard, and it would not give too much work to the Department to make up these grades.

Mr. McLELAN. That would embarrass dealers very greatly. It would lead to endless trouble in labelling all the various grades of goods, although it might be in the interest of the public.

Mr. CASEY. If the grades were established, dealers would have sets of labels, such as coffee mixture No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and so on. I do not think the amount of trouble to be undergone is any reason for shirking that trouble. If we are going to provide for the inspection of food at all, we must make it thorough, no matter what it costs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It does seem to me that, without some condition of this kind, the whole usefulness of that part of the Act will be destroyed. It is important that when goods are put on the market the person purchasing them should know whether he is getting value for his money or not. We contemplate saying to the manufacturer: You shall have the opportunity of adulterating your goods, provided the adulteration is not injurious to health; but it reduces the value of the goods, and therefore we make it incumbent upon you, in proportion as you reduce the value, to state on your label the quantity of the foreign ingredient that you have introduced. For instance, if the article is coffee, let the manufacturer be required to label it "coffee mixture, three-fourths pure." If on an analysis it is found to contain more than one-fourth of the foreign ingredient, he shall be held to have violated the Act. This seems to me so important that I think an effort should be made to accomplish it; and in this way you will accomplish it without any hardship on the manufacturer, and you will do away with that competition which exists among the manufacturers, and which leads them to reduce the price of the article sold by increasing the quantity of the foreign substance in it. The tendency will also be to induce people to demand a pure article, which will be in the interest of both the trade and the consumer.

Mr. McLELAN. This matter will be considered by the House, and if it is the sense of the House that that should

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

be adopted, and that it would not be too onerous to the trade to require the exact proportions of foreign substance to be specified, I have no objection to its being added to the Bill.

Mr. KRANZ. I believe that for practical purposes it is not necessary to distinguish the various grades of adulteration; we should only distinguish between pure goods and adulterated goods. We want our people to use pure goods; we want them to give them pure coffee; if they want to adulterate it they can do so for themselves; but if an article is adulterated, it is immaterial to know how far the adulteration has taken place.

Mr. MILLS. If we have power to deal with the subject at all, there can be no possible objection in requiring the quantity of the foreign ingredient to be indicated. For instance, a dealer in the country orders from a manufacturer of coffee so much ground coffee, worth so much; he wants to get an article suited to the demand; he knows that pure coffee cannot be obtained for the price he is willing to pay; he knows beforehand that it is adulterated, but it is important that the public at large should know. There can be no objection therefore that the manufacturers should mark on the packages the quantities in the mixture.

Mr. KRANZ. I think it would be very difficult to find out the extent of the adulteration.

On section 20,

Mr. CASEY. There is a provision in this section which may act harshly on the vendor. Articles of the same nature is rather a wide description. For instance, if a sample of adulterated coffee were found in a store, a strict construction of this clause would allow the excise to seize not only all the coffee adulterated but all the other coffee. The sample is subject to analysis; it may take some time before it will be analysed and in the meantime the vendor will be subject to the seizure.

Mr. McLELAN. We will insert the words "of the same kind and quality."

Mr. DAVIES. There will be some difficulty in carrying that out. The Minister might rather state with other articles of the same nature which belong to another person and which are found in the same place at another time. If a package is seized for analysis it may take some time before it is analysed, and when the excise officer went to seize the balance it might be sold or have been taken away; and to prevent the seizure of other coffee obtained since then, I would suggest that the words "which may have been in the place which at the time when the articles was seized," replace those in the Bill.

Mr. WILSON. How is the officer going to prove that the article was there at the time. It would be very difficult for him to prove that or for the vendor to prove it was not there. This will be thoroughly impracticable. While we are perfectly willing to provide that no article should be adulterated, we ought not to embarrass the trader, and I think we are throwing sufficient difficulties around him already, and ought not to place him in such a position when there is really no necessity for it.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resumed itself into Committee.

On section 22,

Mr. FISHER. Does the Minister intend to include the second sub section or not?