

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It was destroyed I think.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—What prosecutions followed?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know whether it was followed up.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I undertake to say there was no prosecution. I fail to see the use of passing legislation of this character, unless the machinery of the statute is set in motion to prosecute such wholesale violations of the Act as were represented by the shipment to which I allude.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The question is, which is the better way to circulate the goods which Canada produces? Every one will admit that the trade in the canned goods line has not developed as it should. There is no doubt about that. We have the goods. We have the best materials in the world, and we have all the facilities for producing them. Now we propose to direct how they shall reach the consumer. The trade is the only channel through which they can reach the consumer. Is there a firm in the world better known than Crosse & Blackwell? Would they put their name on any article which they did not know was A-1, the very best possible? We had to make an exception in favour of lobsters and in favour of fish, and why should the same principle not apply to other canned goods? The packer is not known in many cases. Sometimes it is a small concern. Factories are built in Canada that will not be known outside the boundary line. We would not know where they were. They would not be as responsible as the wholesale dealer. He is the man who buys. He takes the whole product of an establishment. He may take the whole product of several establishments. If it is going to stimulate trade and give larger facilities to the consumer to buy his goods, is it not wiser to at least try it? The Act does not relieve the packer from the consequences of his putting up an inferior article. He is liable to have his license cancelled and goods found on the premises confiscated, and he is liable also to the penalties provided in the Act. This is only an alterna-

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

tive. It is merely permissive. After all, I do not think it is wise to direct how trade shall be carried on. Trade is too large a condition of things for us to interfere with.

Hon. Mr. POWER—How would that argument apply to the case of apples?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The name of the grower is not on the apples. You do not know where an apple is grown nowadays, in nine cases out of ten. In the month of July, the dealers go round the country and buy up the whole of the orchards. You or I or anybody else cannot now buy a dozen barrels of apples. You cannot give an order for half a dozen barrels, because it is the large man who buys the orchard, and packs the fruit, and it is his name that is put on the barrels.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—My hon. friend is scarcely correct in that statement. This Act has no reference to the packing of apples. This is the Canned Goods Act, while the inspection of fruit is settled by another statute altogether. I am entirely in accord with the Bill. I think that it is in the right direction. I have not been able—and I have made several attempts—to get the statute of last year, in order that I might compare them, but I took some interest in the question last year, and understood it rather well at that time. The Bill is introduced in the first instance contained drastic provisions that the name of the packer must be put on all canned goods. Before it had reached this House, a very strong protest arose—I am now speaking of my own personal knowledge—in the east from the lobster packers, who explained to us that the trade had assumed a very satisfactory shape. I do not think that five per cent of the lobsters packed in Canada are consumed in this country. They are for foreign consumption. The agents of large foreign houses buy them; firms on whose respectability and reputation the article is sent to the consumer, in Europe. The label of the wholesaler goes upon the goods. That has been the practice. The Bill as it passed in the House of Commons last year would have stopped all that, and would have practically destroyed the trade. The large dealers are not such fools as to allow their