

who have taken an interest in this and brought forward various propositions that in deference to the discussion which has occurred in the House, I wish to propose several slight changes in the form of the Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite have shown a great distrust of the power which the Bill apparently places in the hands of the minister, and in deference to that objection I have changed the wording in such a way as to remove the objection that hon. gentlemen brought forward. I hope that they will appreciate the sincerity with which I said that in this Bill, as in others, the present Minister of Agriculture, at any rate, has no desire to assume a responsibility which is not necessary, and when the sections are reached—

Mr. FOSTER. How about Dundonald?

Mr. FISHER. There are, I think, occasions when it is necessary for certain people to assert themselves, and when the country supports them in that assertion, the proof is very clear that the parties were right to assert themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. That is just a diversion.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; a diversion which the hon. gentleman is very fond of in the House, but which in the country does not pay him so well. In regard to the more pertinent protest raised by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I may say that I have considered very carefully the possible occurrence of what he pointed out might occur, in the way of small establishments insisting on inspection and, by what I might call colourable arrangements requiring inspection under this Act, and, as we will see when we reach that section, I have provided that establishments shall only come under the operation of the section of this Act which apply to meat inspection by order in council, and that the order in council shall not be given unless the establishments appear to be legitimately and bona fide engaged in the export trade as defined in the definitions of this Bill. These are the chief changes; but when we come to the sections, there will be other slight alterations to make. I am going to bow to the desire of my hon. friends opposite, and put into the Bill one or two definitions which were left out as it was first drafted. I am glad to do this, because it will relieve the minister of the necessity of providing by rule and regulation for these particular points, and also will relieve him from some extra responsibility in dealing with these points. Now, I will move that we take up and discuss the Bill section by section.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister forget the request I made to prepare a sort of detailed estimate, so far as possible, of the financial side of this question? We would like to know how much will be required to put the Act into operation and administer it.

Mr. FISHER. I have not got any detailed statement. I have discussed it with the officers, and I see no reason to change much what I said before in regard to that point. I am willing to admit that the amount which I stated before, \$60,000, under the present form of the Bill, was probably a little less than will be required. I should be disposed to amend that by calling it \$75,000. That is based on the expectation that a certain number of inspectors will be required absolutely for the different establishments the year round; also making allowance for a certain number in addition of general inspectors who would have to deal with establishments where their presence would not be required the whole year, and perhaps some establishments where their presence will be required constantly for only a few months of the year. That estimate is based on the scale of salaries which are paid to other inspectors in the department and in the country.

Mr. FOSTER. That is hardly satisfactory. The minister says that he has revised his former opinion of \$60,000, and will now raise his estimate to \$75,000. He must have made the difference between \$60,000 and \$75,000 on some estimated basis. What would be satisfactory to the committee would be the basis on which the minister made his increased estimate. That is simply touching the financial side. The other side is equally important. There is no use in the world putting paper legislation on the statute-book unless it is well enforced, and we would like the minister to state in some detail his system of enforcement, so that the committee may be able to judge whether it is worth while passing this legislation or not. I must say we have had a great deal of this indefiniteness in reference to my hon. friend's various departments of work; we have found that in the end they have cost us very much more than was the conception of the committee at the initial stages of the legislation. There is a strong example of that in the veterinary arrangements of my hon. friend, which have run into very large figures. I think the minister must know about his plan of enforcement, the number of officers it will require, the grades of the officers, and the scale of salaries, and then a fairly good estimate for contingencies, so as to give the committee some idea whether the machinery is adequate.

Mr. FISHER. I would rather take exception to my hon. friend's statement that the work of this department has generally gone beyond the estimates given of its probable cost. I am afraid he will not agree with me, but I am rather proud of the quantity of effective work that has been done in this country by the Department of Agriculture, considering the price that has been paid for it. I have given a good deal of consideration to what has been done in this direction in other countries, particularly in the United