

(iii) such information respecting the nature, quality, age, size, material content, composition, geographic origin, performance, use or method of manufacture or production of the prepackaged product as may be prescribed.

It is my view that whatever is properly required to be done in line with the suggestions that have been made about date stamping, age stamping, care labelling and storage labelling, if it is within the purview of this act, can be done in accordance with clause 10 (b)(iii) which refers to the nature of the goods, the quality of the goods, the age of the goods, the material content, performance, use or method of manufacture or production. In my view this covers completely and adequately all information that is required to be on the label and which would be useful to consumers in relation to age or care of the product.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It was agreed that motions Nos. 3 and 4 would be debated together. Perhaps for the record the Chair should put motion No. 4 which I neglected to do at the time of the agreement. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) moves motion No. 4:

That Bill C-180, an act respecting the packaging, labelling, sale, importation and advertising of prepackaged and certain other products, be amended by adding immediately after sub-paragraph (iii) of sub-clause (b) of clause 10 the following:

"(iv) the date beyond which the prepackaged product should not be used or may not be sold for consumption and such information respecting the conditions required for storage and maintenance, including temperature, as may be prescribed."

It is the understanding of the Chair that it was agreed that motions Nos. 3 and 4 would be put together on the one vote and that motion No. 4 would follow motion No. 3 as to the result. If that is the understanding, I will put the question to the House. All those in favour of motion No. 3 will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 75 (11), a recorded division on motions Nos. 3 and 4 stands deferred.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre) moved:

That Bill C-180, an act respecting the packaging, labelling, sale, importation and advertising of prepackaged and certain other products, be amended by adding immediately after sub-clause 2 of clause 11 the following:

"(3) Where the Governor in Council is of the opinion that the quantity of product in a container is an amount, by virtue of it be a fractional quantity or an odd number or any other

Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act

reason, that is likely to contribute to the deception of the consumer as to the value of the product, the Governor in Council may on the recommendation of the minister make regulations respecting the quantity of product that may be placed in a container."

He said: Mr. Speaker, whether or not the minister has a change of heart and decides, even though he may be alone on his side, to support motion No. 2, it seems to me that motion No. 5 is a useful and necessary one. The purpose of the amendment is to give the minister power to require that the quantity of a product in a container be a simple amount, so that simple people like me in a shopping centre can readily compute the cost of an ounce. The number of ounces should be readily divisible by the price, the price by the ounces, or whatever the measure is. As the bill now stands, the minister may limit the number of different sized containers the industry uses for a similar product but he cannot specify the exact size of the containers or the quantity the containers may contain.

• (9:30 p.m.)

As a result, toothpaste manufacturers—this is probably the most horrendous example—can have three sizes, small, medium and large. They can have small, regular or family sizes. But I defy the minister or anybody else to figure out what these sizes mean. In conformity with the measure before us, these companies will be allowed to sell containers containing amounts such as 2½ grams or ounces, 5-3/18 grams or ounces or 9-7/32 grams or ounces. As long as manufacturers use the same sized tubes they will satisfy the provisions of the bill. If the minister allows small, regular, family, giant, large or economy—whatever handles the manufacturers put on them—as standard sizes, the manufacturers will put screwball amounts in them and not even consumers of the highest intellect will be able to stand in front of a shelf and decide what is the best value per ounce or gram, per tube or anything else.

All we are suggesting in this amendment is that in addition to the authority the minister will have under the bill to prevent proliferation of size, the kinds of containers or the advertising that is put on labels, such as giant, economy, new, or new-new—it would not matter if it were New Democratic if they used the term in that sense—he shall have authority to specify quantities, in the various numbers and sizes of containers, which are easily divisible by the price, or vice versa.

According to some witnesses who appeared before the committee there is technical constraint on the number of products and the amounts that may go into a package. Witnesses on behalf of the manufacturers and others suggested this is the fact. They suggested that one would have to turn the spigot off a little sooner or a little later in order to get a measurable amount of product into a package or container. I cannot conceive of one product that could not be put into a package or container in an amount that would suit the best interests of the consumer, although perhaps not the best interest of the manufacturer or packager.