

month of the year, and if an inspector comes to make an inspection they are handed down to him. For instance, I am in the business myself. My name is only on the can. It might be a difficult matter for me to prove from whom I bought the goods, after they were stored on the shelf four or five months, and there is such a great agitation at the present time against canned goods, that these people who are canning goods are seeking some means of escape in case the goods are not pure. I think it is of the greatest importance that the packer's name should be on the can, and if the wholesale man wants his name put on, it is a very easy matter to have stamped on the can: 'Goods packed by So-and-So, put up for So-and-So,' naming the wholesale man. That would make it clear.

Hon. Mr. JAFFRAY—I think that if this is fairly considered, it will be seen at once that it is more important generally for the many buying the goods that the name of the merchant should be the one that is prominent rather than that of the packer. As a rule the merchant is better known than the packer. He is more easily got at, and has a reputation to maintain for the goods which he delivers, and has to take care of. In addition to that, the merchant advertises his goods, pushes the sale of them, and it is not his business to have the parties buying from him pass him to go to the packers. I am sure that if provision is made that in every case where it is required of the dealer, he should give the name of the packer, it is quite sufficient, and it can be followed up, and it can be ascertained whose fault it is if the goods are inferior.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—Crosse & Blackwell are the greatest purveyors in the world. They get salmon from northern British Columbia. It is shown that they purchase the salmon from the packers and they insist on their name being on the cans and not the name of the packer. If Crosse & Blackwell are not better than any dozen packers in the country, I should like to know it. The merchant is well known and you look to the merchant for the quality of the food you purchase.

Hon. M^r. BAIRD—It seems to me it is quite evident there must be some desire on the part of the promoters of the Bill to get rid of the responsibility for it. Take any other class of canned goods, except the matter of provisions, the names of the packer is always on the package. Why should they want their names left off the canned goods, because certainly the packers must have a reputation? No doubt the reputation of the packer is just as good as the reputation of the wholesale man. There is no reason why, if they put up good goods, they should not want their name on them.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It seems to me that the fallacy lies in this, that up to the present time the name of the packer had to be impressed upon the package. The trade in canned goods, notwithstanding what has been said by my hon. friend from Yale and my hon. friend from Kingston, has been going on without any diminution apparently. We have amended this clause from time to time, and we have not gone as far as absolving the packer from the responsibility of placing his brand upon the package. If that be the case, it seems to me very fallacious to say that this is an impediment, so to speak, that will prevent the dealer or the wholesale merchant from purchasing the goods with a view to placing his labels upon the package. He can do that now. There is no prohibition under the law to prevent him from putting his label upon the package, and let me point out this case, wherein I say the amendment would be ineffectual towards disclosing the person originally responsible. Many of those goods are bought by foreign dealers. If a foreign dealer should purchase lobsters or fish, as the case may be, and have his label placed upon them, how are you going to exercise the right embodied in the statute of demanding from him who the packer is, or was? My recollection is that during the recess something like two cars of salmon were seized by the department owing to the goods being in a partly putrid state. Can my hon. friend say whether the government prosecuted the parties who put up the salmon that was seized in Montreal? I think two cars were seized.