

wisely and properly went into the Bill in the fullest possible way, the House is entitled to the most complete explanation from the minister in regard to every detail of the Bill.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member or Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I am afraid, has received some incorrect information in regard to this Bill. There was no intention of imposing any onerous or improper conditions on people engaged in the business of packing lobsters. The Bill, as it came from the department, did not impose any such onerous conditions. The Bill was necessary because the work of inspecting establishments where fish is canned under the Meat and Canned Foods Act has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was necessary, in order that the work might be carried on properly, that the law should be clearly defined. The Bill, as it came from the Department of Marine and Fisheries—and this is the only amendment made by the Senate—provided that:

Cans of lobster shall contain the following minimum amounts of dry lobster meat:

A one-pound can, 13 ounces, avoirdupois;

A three-quarter pound can, 9½ ounces, avoirdupois.

And so on. The Bill was referred to a committee of this House composed of members of both political parties—the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries. That committee met, and, after considering the Bill, did not think this provision went far enough. Instead of providing that a one-pound can of lobster should contain 13 ounces of lobster meat, they amended the Bill and provided that a one-pound can should contain 16 ounces of lobster meat and cans of other weights in proportion. My hon. friend will therefore see that it was the action of a select standing committee of this House that imposed—if it can be said to have imposed—a more onerous burden on those who are the canners of lobsters. The Bill as it came from the department, and as it was introduced by me to the House, provided for the quantity of canned meat which had always been contained in a pound can, but the committee thought that when a man buys a pound can of lobster he ought to buy 16 ounces. Therefore the committee amended the Bill, it came before the House and was passed as amended. The Bill then went to the Senate, where, as my hon. friend says, there were a number of gentlemen who are very familiar with the whole lobster business, and it was considered very thoroughly in the Senate. The amendment the Senate

[Mr. Macdonald.]

made was to reduce the quantity of dry lobster meat that a pound can should contain from 16 ounces to 14 ounces, not to 13 ounces as was provided by the Bill as I introduced it to the House. The Bill comes back from the Senate with the provision that a pound can of lobster shall contain 14 ounces of dry lobster meat and other cans in similar proportion. The reason given for this amendment to the Senate was that it would be a hardship to require 16 ounces of dry meat, because a pound of lobster meat requires 2 ounces of liquid to give it the proper quality and flavour. If 16 ounces of dry meat were required the cans would have to be enlarged, necessitating changes in the can making and stamping machines, in the size of the tin plates and in the cutting dies. These points were all considered by the committee, and it was believed that as the Act would not become operative until December, 1918, there would be ample time to ascertain if the increased quantity of meat required to be put in a can would cause a hardship to the industry. The Senate, after thoroughly considering the matter, came to the conclusion that 14 ounces, not 13 ounces, should be contained in a pound can, for the reason that a pound can of dry lobster requires 2 ounces of liquid in order to give it the proper quality and flavour. That amendment is quite acceptable to the department and the Government. That is the only change, with this exception: There has been a can put up from time to time which is known as a picnic can. That picnic can contains 10 ounces. The Senate struck that out. They said that in view of the fact that their changes provide a can of 9½ ounces, it is unnecessary to continue the picnic can of 10 ounces, because there is only half an ounce difference between the two, and to have one can of 9½ ounces and another of 10 would lead to confusion. I think there is something in that view of the case, and there is no reason why the picnic can should not be cut out. These are the only changes made by the Senate, and they are amendments which we are quite willing to accept.

Mr. LOGGIE: I happen to be a member of the committee to which this Bill was referred but unfortunately I was absent when it was under discussion. I certainly would not have given my assent to the report of the committee as it came before the House, nor to the Bill as it passed the House and went to the Senate. As to the contents of tins, whether they should be 16 ounces of dry meat, or 13, or 14, or 15