

committed, if there has been a fraud. I think that, as it is, we are preventing the useless expenditure of money, in case the public would be satisfied that the inspector has not given, as will be seen by clause 11, that certificate of inspection, except when he was convinced that the produce which is sold is one which contains the ingredients which give a certain standard to the fertiliser.

Mr. CASEY. I want to understand more clearly what the inspector's tag is to have upon it. Is it to be a statement, simply, that samples have been taken for analysis, and not that the analysis has been made?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does not state that the analysis has been made.

Mr. CASEY. Or, if it has been made, what the result is?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does not state the result.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see that there will be any good in that. I cannot see any force in the hon. gentleman's argument that that certificate will be any safeguard to the public. I admit that it might create a certain impression of safety in the public mind, and I fear that it would. Any official tag of this kind would be taken by the public, who were not thoroughly acquainted with the Act, to be a certificate that the fertiliser was all right, and would be accepted by them as a certificate of the genuineness of the article, which it is not, in any degree. I think, instead of providing a safeguard, it would be very apt to mislead the public, and to be the very reverse of a safeguard, to be an injury to them, by making them think the article had been analysed and found satisfactory, when it had not been analysed at all. I do not suppose the Minister had any other intention than to provide all the safeguards possible; but if he wishes to provide a real safeguard for the public, and to give a recommendation of meritorious articles of that kind, he should insist that the sample sent up by the inspectors should be analysed as soon as sent up, and that the result of the analysis should be printed or written on the tag given out by the inspector. I do not see that there would be much more expense in putting that on the tag than in putting something else; and as far as the analysis is concerned, there is no use in our having a chief analyst, and paying him fees, unless we get some work out of him. But even in that case, there is some risk of the public suffering, from the fact that a manufacturer of compounds of this kind cannot be expected to have a perfectly uniform sample throughout the season; and although the sample examined by the chief analyst might be all right, a subsequent sample might be worse, without any corrupt intention on the part of the manufacturer. If a detailed certificate were given as to the goodness of the first sample, the customer might take that as meaning that he had a right to expect the rest as equally good. But there is no safeguard in the mere statement that samples have been sent up for analysis.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There would be this safeguard, at all events, that it would complete the chain of evidence against fraud. And there is the farther protection that the inspector, seeing this is produced, and that it bears the same number as the sample which has been sent off for analysis, it is not to be presumed that after the chief analyst has analysed a fertiliser and having the certificate of the manufacturer, as against his own experience, would allow the inspector to give a certificate to that article, unless the analysis of the chief analyst coincided with the certificate given by the manufacturer. But there is something in my hon. friend's suggestion, and I will see that an amendment is put in the Bill, that immediately after the analysis the inspector shall be supplied with a copy and attach it to his tag.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman does not intend that the inspector shall put the tag on until after the analysis has been made and found satisfactory.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think, after the analysis, the inspector should be informed that he should not give a certificate.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be very likely to mislead the public if there was an official announcement of this character, unless in cases where there has been a satisfactory inspection. If the public find there has been an inspection they will not scrutinise its results very closely. If there is some reason why any certificate should be given before analysis, the tag ought to contain a distinct statement that it is not upon analysis, or that it is not upon inspection—something that would show to the public that it was not intended to do that. When we consider the number of misleading advertisements, and how easily the public is gulled with illusory trade marks, we at once see how valuable such a tag might be in the case of a low grade.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know that in France very severe laws have been passed against adulteration, and still the manufacturers have been successful in evading them, to some extent. I think that suggestion of my hon. friend should be adopted, that is to say, that after a certain standard for certain fertilisers has been given by the chief analyst, the inspector should be supplied with a copy of the analysis, and then a person selling under that certificate would be exposed to the rigors of the law if the article did not contain that certificate.

Mr. BAIN. The protection to the purchasers of manure is the fact that the analysis of the test sample that has been supplied to the Inland Revenue Department is the basis upon which we assume that all these grades shall be tried; and if, at a subsequent date, a farmer purchased a sample of this manure and found that it did not test equivalent to that sample under which he had received a certificate from the Department, I should think he was open to the penalties provided by this Act. There is another difficulty. This Act applies to manure worth only \$10 a ton. Now, the first question a farmer asks is: Will this thing pay? If there is to be an analysis again, if there is to be a supervision of these goods introduced in bulk, and if they are to be sub-divided—and I think it will be found that the great bulk of these manures have to be sub-divided, either into sacks or barrels—it will almost necessitate that each one of these samples will require tags attached to them if the inspection is going to be of value. A dealer may bring in a couple of car loads, perhaps 25 tons, but most men will only purchase in quantities of, say, one ton. The result will be that this inspection and these certificates and tags, to be of value, would need to be applicable to this whole consignment, divided into quantities. Now here is a large field for the dishonest dealer. It is the easiest thing in the world to mix into these agricultural manures a certain quantity of worthless raw material that will add both to the bulk and weight, and until it is applied to the crops and its quality is known, the farmer has no alternative and no redress. I think it is a matter to be considered, before you provide for this inspector's certificate to be attached to the samples, whether it would be worth the cost involved, because if the inspection is made and tags have to be furnished for these articles it will all cost money, and it must be added to the price of the fertiliser. The great protection under this Bill to the purchaser is the fact that the dealer has to furnish to the Department a test sample, which must contain a certain percentage of these valuable ingredients, and a farmer, by preserving the sample he has purchased from the retail agent, and having it analysed again, shows that it does not grade up to that standard could then prosecute the dealer for fraud—if such be the case. There, it seems to me, is the place where you can catch the dishonest manufacturer.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the view of the hon. Minister, the 3rd section, which provides for sending a sample to the chief analyst for analysis, ought to go a little further, or