

the committee originally recommended that sixteen ounces be placed in the can in order to satisfy the public that they were getting value for what they were paying. After an experience of forty years in the business, the largest canner in the Maritime provinces and the keenest of them all, he declared that he was satisfied with the decision to put fourteen ounces in the can, and that decision was accepted by everybody. I have been interested in the lobster industry all my life. I represent the largest lobster fishing county in New Brunswick. I know something about the industry, and I know that if you have fourteen ounces of dry meat in a can you have a better quality of lobster than if you have only twelve ounces. That does not matter so much to the lobster packers, if they can get a regulation adopted which will permit them to put twelve ounces in a one-pound can. The people will pay the same price for the can containing twelve ounces of dry meat as they paid for the can containing fourteen ounces. The statute passed in 1917 was not to go into effect until December, 1918, and now we have the minister asking that we cancel that legislation. The canners have no excuse now for asking that the legislation be not put into force, because they have their cans made to contain fourteen ounces of dry meat. A can containing twelve ounces of dry meat will not appeal to the public. I do not see why this resolution is brought in. The hon. member for Northumberland is willing to stand by the minister now, but in the testimony which he gave before the committee in 1917 he expressed himself as ready to accept the provision which was then made. Public opinion will be against this change, and will be more strongly against it when it is put in operation. I advise my hon. friend, as strongly and as urgently as I can, to withdraw this legislation. It will have a bad effect upon the people.

Mr. LOGGIE: In the list of cans packed that we have here, there are two that are under twelve ounces.

Mr. COPP: When were they packed?

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not know.

Mr. COPP: They were packed before there was any regulation regarding the weight at all.

Mr. LOGGIE: No, I do not think so.

Mr. COPP: There was no Act at all before the 15th December, 1918.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would not make any difference.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not know that it would make any difference.

Mr. COPP: I do not see why it would not make a difference if they were not packed according to this law. They were packed according to the old law, and there was not any regulation whatever.

Mr. LOGGIE: There was not any regulation until this law came into force. But the large packers, meeting at Halifax, discussed the matter fairly and openly, and contended that more than six ounces of dry lobster meat could not be put in the present half-pound can without crushing the meat too much. As for the public interest, personally I do not see how it is not protected. When I pack a can of No. 2 blueberries the net contents are not more than twenty ounces, and yet this is known as a No. 2 can to the public. In the United States they compel us to put the net weight on. The Canadian Government is doing the same thing now. The object is to make the law uniform, that tinned goods must have the net contents on the label. The Robert Simpson Company of Halifax and O'Leary & Lee, of Halifax, are by all odds the largest handlers of canned lobsters in Canada. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) has referred to the output of our firm. It is only a fraction of that of the Robert Simpson Company of Halifax. The representatives of these two leading firms, at the convention in Halifax, came to the conclusion that twelve ounces was the proper weight of dry meat.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend said this afternoon that he opposed that idea.

Mr. LOGGIE: The hon. gentleman had better understand what I did. I did not oppose that idea at Halifax; I did not take any part in the discussion. I opposed it on the floor of the House, as the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) pointed out. I said when they proposed thirteen ounces that if I had been present at the committee on Marine and Fisheries and they had suggested thirteen ounces I would have opposed it. I also said that if I had been present on the floor of Parliament when they changed it to sixteen ounces I would have opposed that. I agreed with the compromise of fourteen ounces when it came back from the Senate. That is all I said upon the matter.

Mr. TURGEON: If the hon. gentleman was satisfied with fourteen ounces at the time why is he not satisfied now?