

quarter of beef and to inspect it. If he has any doubt he can take it to the Dominion analyst and have it examined. He can permit it or not to be put in cans, and during all the time he has authority to follow it with his inspection. He can cause the contents of the can to be analysed by the Dominion analyst and condemned. He can drag that canner to a tribunal constituted under the Adulteration Act, and have him condemned to penalties, and he is obliged to report that condemnation to the department. How can my hon. friend say that under these circumstances the Adulteration Act has no application?

Mr. FISHER. I will point out the difference. In the first place, the inspector under the Adulteration Act is not a veterinary surgeon. He does not know the diseases of animals. He sees the carcass hanging there, but he is not competent to say whether the animals was diseased or not; he sees the can, but he is not competent to say whether the contents were healthy or not before being put into the can. When the analysis takes place under the Adulteration Act, the analyst is not able to say whether the animal whose meat he is analysing was diseased or not; he can only tell whether an adulterant has been added, whether there is anything in the actual contents of the can which is objectionable from a sanitary point of view. The inspector who may go and seize the beef may be a competent man under the General Inspection Act, but is not required to be a competent man to decide whether the animal is healthy or not.

Mr. MONK. How can my hon. friend talk with such absolute ignorance of the Adulteration Act? To begin with, he says that the man who inspects the meat is not a veterinary surgeon. Why should he not be? There is no reason. He is supposed to possess all the qualifications required. There is nothing in my hon. friend's Bill which says the inspector must be a veterinary surgeon, and he may not be. He may not be a veterinary surgeon, but the meat is canned already, and what does he know about the meat once it has been canned? What does he know about the vegetables, or fruit? But the Adulteration Act provides specially that no man can act as an inspector unless he has passed an examination by a duly constituted board and been declared qualified. So the hon. gentleman's objection in that regard has no foundation whatever. Under the legislation that exists to-day, I claim that we can name inspectors qualified to inspect meat after the slaughter of the animals, after the meat has gone through a certain stage of preparation, after it has been canned. The government has that power to-day. We are doing nothing less by this legislation than providing a new system of inspection, doubling, trebling, making tenfold, the cost of an operation on which we might accomplish ten times better by

Mr. MONK.

amending in any way necessary the Adulteration Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words on this by way of suggestion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is the third occasion the Bill has been discussed in committee, and I have allowed it to go on. But rule 53 says:

In proceedings in committee of the whole House upon Bills, the preamble is first postponed, and then every clause considered by the committee in its proper order; the preamble and title to be last considered.

There is nothing before the committee now.

Mr. MONK. I touched upon this subject, because the minister intimated that he intended introducing a number of amendments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would like the committee to decide whether they wish to continue the general discussion, or to take up the Bill clause by clause; because there is nothing before the committee now.

Mr. FISHER. I think there should be some latitude allowed as I do not wish to choke off the discussion in any way whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. I was just about to say that there are two peoples for whom we aim at providing healthy food—foreigners and the people at home. It is, in my judgment, correct to provide healthy food for both, but more especially for the people at home. In one case we do it for the purpose of advancing trade and commerce and therefore that is, to my mind, a good and sufficient reason, in the other to safeguard and promote the health of our people at home. Of course, when saying that I regret to say that I am obliged to differ from some hon. gentleman who do not see the necessity for inspection or for such a law as this. In my judgment there are good and sufficient reasons for it, but I think there is a great deal in the suggestion which has been made by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and by the hon. gentleman who just took his seat a few moments ago, that we might possibly combine the two offices in one individual and in this way promote economy and secure efficiency, that is the provincial officer who is acting under provincial authority, and the federal officer under this Act. To my mind it does not seem to be a very impossible task. I am not going to say anything about the adulteration of food which extends over a wider field, but in regard to the inspection of meat for the consumer at home and abroad what is to prevent the possibility of an understanding being reached between the federal health officer, or the provincial government and the federal government so that one individual might