

kets and the United Kingdom, hence the change in the wording of the subsection to "markets outside of Canada."

Section 3. Section 12 C, which is to be repealed, provides for the seizure of unsound fish or shellfish before packing, but does not make any provision for so dealing with unsound fish or shellfish when in the cans. As fish and shellfish found to be unsound prior to canning are amply provided for in section 12 B, the amendment to section 12 C is intended to cover unsound goods in cans. That is, we have the same right even after they are canned.

Section 4. The amendment to section 12 D is intended to fix definitely the size of each of the five sizes of cans at present legalized. They are the same sizes as before. As a matter of fact, it is especially to empower inspecting officers to seize and hold lightweight cans, pending a decision as to their disposal. We have not that right under the law as it stands.

Section 5. Section 12 E at present simply designates the different varieties of British Columbia salmon. As there has been and still is a more or less insistent call for the official grading of the different varieties of salmon when packed in the cans, the amendment provides for such being done if and when it is deemed necessary. Also, the amended section provides for transferring the naming of the varieties to the regulations, because of anticipated changes when grading takes place.

Section 6. Section 12 F gives the minister sole power to close a cannery in the event of the provisions of the Act not being complied with. That is the section as it was. It sometimes happens that an inspecting officer finds a cannery operating under such a state of filth as to call for the immediate stoppage of operations. Delays in reporting to and receiving instructions from Ottawa allow canning to go on under undesirable conditions frequently for too long a time. The amendment consequently seeks to give power to the officers to take immediate action when such conditions are discovered and, of course, to report to Ottawa.

Section 9. Section 12 G is deemed to be entirely unnecessary and, therefore, apt to lead to confusion. Consequently, its deletion is proposed. All that is provided for by section 12 G is already provided for in other sections.

Section 10. The proposed amendment to subsection 1 of section 12 H, is, in the first

place, to provide that canned fish or shellfish imported into Canada to be again exported must show the name of the country of origin, in order that they may not be mistaken for Canadian goods. In the second place it is to provide that no misleading mark or name concerning the kind or variety of canned fish or shellfish imported for sale in Canada be used. The last provision is intended to stop the practice of Alaska packers sending Alaska red salmon into Canada labelled as sockeye, as this meantime permits them unfairly to compete with British Columbia sockeye, a much superior fish. I think that covers all the amendments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just one question. Will the minister intimate, if his notes supply the information, what the state of the law was as to the first part of clause 9 which now appears to be clause 10 of his bill, the very last?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is there anything on those cans, when the label is gone, to indicate the name of the packer?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): That is an unfortunate thing. A case of ptomaine poisoning may occur; the label may be gone, and there will then be no way of finding out the name and address of the packer. Would it not be a wise provision to have the packer's name, number and address printed on the can itself? A label is easily torn off, and then you have no means of tracing the packer and finding out where the can comes from.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The same thing exists as regards other kinds of canned goods than fish. Section 12-H, referred to by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) reads, as it is in the act:

All cans of fish or shellfish imported into Canada shall be correctly labelled so as to indicate the kind and quality of their contents, the minimum weight in avoirdupois of the contents of the cans in the case of canned fish and of the dry meat in the can in the case of canned shellfish, the place of origin and the name and address of the person, firm or corporation by whom they are packed or by whom they are imported; provided that canned fish or canned shellfish imported into Canada to be exported again need not be so labelled.

The new proposed clause will read:

All cans of fish or shellfish imported into Canada shall be correctly labelled so as to indicate the kind and quality of their contents, the minimum weight in avoirdupois of the contents of the cans in the case of canned fish and of the dry meat in the can in the case of