

would apply. Any lawyer would tell him that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I should think the words would carry that meaning.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the case of farmers who supply small quantities of butter to private customers each week, will it be necessary to have the name of the maker and the weight of the package stamped on each package?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, if they dispose of it in the original container. It is impossible to pass any measure without causing some inconvenience to some people, but the lesser inconvenience must be submitted to in the general interest. The farmer must have his oiled paper in any case, and it will cost him very little to have the name and weight stamped on it when he purchases it.

Mr. NESBITT: The phrase "articles weighed or measured at the time of sale" would probably cover that. In any case, it would not be a serious matter to have the weight and the name stamped on? Why are exports excluded from the operation of the Bill?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Any one who has talked with manufacturers knows that there are many articles purchased for foreign markets which the purchaser desires to have marked and put up in a way which will suit the market to which they are to be exported rather than the home market.

Mr. NESBITT: I have never been able to see why people manufacturing for export should not manufacture on an honest basis, the same as any one else. I would impress on the minister that the weights should be net weights. Otherwise there will be deception as to packages.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Net weights are called for.

Mr. THORNTON: I see grave difficulties in the operation of a Bill of this kind. For instance, there are many articles which remain on the dealers' shelves in packages, such as evaporated fruit. The law provides that these shall contain only a certain amount of moisture. Evaporation takes place while they are on the retailer's shelves, and it may be that at the time of sale, through this natural evaporation, there is not the same net weight as there was at the time the package was weighed.

Mr. NICKLE: This matter of the weight of packages containing human food received [Mr. Pugsley.]

my attention when I was a member of the legislature of Ontario. My attention was directed more particularly to the weight of bread. At the time the matter was brought to the attention of the legislature, there was no regulation establishing a standard weight for a loaf of bread. The province finally passed a law determining the weight of a standard loaf. Prior to that, the bakers could add to or take from a loaf of bread as they desired, and they varied the weight according to the price of flour, generally to the disadvantage of the consumer. During the discussion it was very forcibly brought to the attention of the committee, and later of the House, that the weight of a loaf of bread varied radically within a period of 24 hours after it left the oven; and if my memory serves me, there is a provision in the Ontario statute that the weight must be that standard weight within a certain period after the bread is baked. I do not know whether such a provision could be made with regard to commodities such as evaporated apples, but I think the minister should consider that aspect of the case, because if the measure is taken to apply to bread there will be difficulties in enforcing the law. We are all agreed on the general principle of the measure. I do not suppose there is a member who would not agree that the purchaser should get what he thinks he is getting as the net weight of the commodity within the package.

I may say that I endeavoured, when the matter was before the Ontario Legislature, to get before the House legislation along the lines suggested by the minister, but I found myself stopped, as the question was raised as to whether or not jurisdiction was vested in the Ontario Legislature. At that time my attention was directed to the fact that manufacturers of commodities that were put up in packages could keep a fixed price by varying the weight of the content in the package, and that the consumer had practically no protection at all. With the exception of the difficulty to which I have referred, I am heartily in accord with the measure proposed, and I trust that in the preparation of the legislation some scheme may be devised that will obviate the difficulties to which I have directed attention.

Mr. MARCIL: I must congratulate the Minister of Trade and Commerce upon this proposed legislation. He should not, however, limit its provisions merely to food.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not so limited. It takes in every commodity.