

erally speaking, the reason is because the measure involves expenditure of public money. It is very difficult to

9 p.m. see why this particular Bill should require a resolution.

Personally I do not believe that any Bill should require a resolution, and I hope that some day the rule in this respect will be amended.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that any money Bill requires a resolution. That is the practice. But why does this Bill require a resolution? Does it require any expenditure of public money?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This Bill is only emendatory of the Meats and Canned Foods Act, which involves an expenditure of money for inspection and other purposes. If the Bill were to be considered just by itself, possibly no resolution would be required; but it is the opinion of the law officer of the House that the Bill must be preceded by a resolution. Now as soon as the Bill is introduced it will go to the committee. I fail to see why hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to think that the public interests will suffer by reason of this Bill. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Leger) thinks that it is a very dangerous principle to reduce the content of any can, or rather he expressed surprise that a container contains a given number of ounces. My hon. friend might as well suggest that a barrel of flour which has contained 196 pounds for a number of years should be made to contain 200 or 201, or something like that. There is no particular virtue about fourteen ounces as the quantity that a lobster can should contain. In fact, 12 ounces is a much better weight because it is three-quarters of a pound, and the content is more easily calculated by the purchasing public; and I would say that upon that ground, if I were asked for my personal judgment, it would be better to have a twelve-ounce than a fourteen-ounce can. But I have told the committee—

Mr. ROBB: Would a sixteen-ounce can not be much better and more satisfactory to the public?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Possibly it might; but gentlemen who know something about the business, and who are in a position to speak authoritatively on the matter, say that you cannot get sixteen ounces into the present can, which is a well-established container.

Mr. ROBB: Make the can larger.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: True, you can make the can larger; and you can make

the flour barrel larger so as to contain 200 pounds. These are simply standardized measures, and so long as the public know the standard measurement no interest can suffer.

Mr. LEGER: The hon. minister says that the barrel containing 196 pounds of flour might be made to contain 200 or 201 pounds. We never calculate a barrel of flour on more than 196 pounds; it is marked on it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Therefore if a pound can of lobster contains twelve ounces, there would be no purpose in calculating on thirteen, or fourteen ounces or anything else, because it is a standard weight. This Bill proposes to establish the standards of weights in four certain sizes of cans for packing lobster.

Mr. COPP: What would you say if the millers came and asked you to change the law so that they could put 165 pounds into their barrels?

Mr. LEGER: If the committee desire to put fourteen ounces into the can, I would like it to be understood that the fishermen shall get fourteen ounces too.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think we can all agree that the fishermen will get it. Now, as I said in response to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), it was my intention that the Bill to be founded on this resolution shall be referred to a committee, who, if they see fit, may again have a hearing of witnesses, just as in 1917.

Mr. TURGEON: It has been stated by the Acting Minister of Fisheries that it had been the custom for years to have no special weight of lobster in the can, and that packers placed anywhere between twelve and sixteen ounces of the dry fish in the can, and that the reason why legislation had been introduced was that public opinion compelled it. The public had found out that on many an occasion they had been deceived, and that instead of getting fourteen or fifteen ounces of dry lobster, they were getting twelve ounces and paying for a pound. That, as I understand it, was the reason for the introduction of legislation. The hon. member for Northumberland is one of the largest packers, and controls perhaps over forty canneries in New Brunswick, half of them in the county of Gloucester which I have the honour to represent. We had him as an authority before the committee. He had not been satisfied when