

There were some candy manufacturers whose labels certainly were not clearly marked for example, in terms of net contents. A chocolate bar of two ounces or over must have a declaration of the net contents. In the case of some of these you really have to look a long time in order to find out how much weight is contained in the bar. We consider that chocolate bars and other products should be labelled clearly, conspicuously and prominently in a position where the consumer can readily find out, without searching among other printed matter, the net contents.

I think this is a proper thing for us to do. I realize that this resulted in the requiring of a lot of labels to be changed—some of them needed to be changed; others were not so bad. However, in order to get uniformity in this we also have asked them to change. I do not see why a chocolate manufacturer—if it is a chocolate manufacturer of which you are thinking, because other things are included in the term “confectionery”—should be exempt. I would like to say that we have made some administrative concessions in terms of these fancy large boxes, where you buy the boxes as well as the chocolates. In such cases, in order not to destroy or injure the aesthetic beauty of the cover, we have allowed the information to be put on the bottom.

Mr. McCLEAVE: My main complaint concerned the large boxes. I was not thinking of chocolate bars. Has this step been taken recently?

Dr. MORRELL: No. Perhaps we had better get this clearly. I am referring to the large boxes, with the picture of the parliament buildings on them, with a ribbon, where you are buying the box. We felt that those boxes were specialty boxes, and we allowed it on the bottom. However, if you buy a five-pound box of ordinary candy, which you see in the shops every day, we do not exempt those. It was just the specialty boxes. I hope I have made myself clear on that.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything further?

Mr. McCLEAVE: The complaint I have received is that while it is generally good practice to print the weights on the top side of the box, the manufacturer says that in some cases the size of the type is too large for the message; in other words, there should be more intermediate ranges in regard to the size and type for the specific boxes.

Dr. MORRELL: I think we made four sizes of type, depending on the size of the main panel of the label. As the size of the label grew, the size of the declaration of net contents grew with it; and when you have a big box the type is fairly large. We, as well, have received some complaints about it, but we felt we had to maintain the principle or we would be back just where we were. As soon as you say, in one case that you can make it a little less, you then have others saying: you did it for them; let us have it.

Mr. McCLEAVE: Would it not be possible to separate this industry from the general food industry, and devise between the department and the industry some more satisfactory regulations as to this type size.

Dr. MORRELL: As I said, we at the beginning did consult all of the food industries or, at least, got opinions from them before these regulations were sent to Mr. Monteith for consideration.

Mr. McCLEAVE: I do not want to pursue this subject except to ask: is it not possible to treat these people somewhat separately, since they are not primarily in the business of selling food?

Mr. MONTEITH (*Perth*): Mr. McCleave, I understand that the regulations including all food packaging, but they were only arrived at after many consultations and meetings, and after an opportunity had been given to the industries to present their case. I know that many months were involved in