

Act, in order to enact the provision in the Bill before us.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister says he can only do this with the consent of the House. That statement is correct. But the House will not assent without sufficient information. Why not drop this section of the Bill, and let the former section stand?

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I will tell the hon. member why; because the new regulations call for a dozen eggs of a different weight than that provided in the section which is being repealed. The old Act gives the weight of a dozen eggs as a pound and a half. The Bill the Minister of Agriculture has introduced calls for different weights, according to the grades of eggs. Extras are eggs that weigh 24 ounces, and No. 1 weighs 23 ounces. So that, unless you repeal the clause the Minister of Trade and Commerce is proposing to repeal, you will have a contradiction in the law. One calls for a dozen eggs to weigh 24 ounces, and the other calls for a dozen eggs to weigh 23 ounces.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is that view and I have no doubt it was responsible for the recommendation that that section be repealed. We will take that matter into consideration. We will let this clause stand and go on with the other clauses. I shall look up the matter and see whether there is a clash or not, and on that will depend whether this will be pressed to repeal or not.

Section as amended, allowed to stand.

On section 3—Packages of food and containers to be marked:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to make some explanation and to suggest some amendments which have been rendered advisable after further consideration. The object of this section is to assure the consumer that when he makes a purchase of something, his purchase is based upon the standards of weights and measures. The old system by which an article was measured, or weighed out, from bulk has been modified of late years very largely by the practice of putting up in containers or cartons different articles of food. These are not marked at present with the weight contained, or with the measurement, if it be other than weight, within the carton itself. This opens a very large field for fraud against the consumer. When a purchaser goes in and buys a certain quantity of commodities of different kinds, he knows

the price per pound and he knows what he is getting if it be measured or weighed out to him. If it be placed in a carton or a container, he is not buying, in fact, by standard weight or by measurement; he is buying by the package. It has been shown that buying food in this way is an expensive method. A number of apt illustrations have been given in different exhibitions and in different ways in Canada where they have been placed side by side with what you get as a pound, or the measure in weight or capacity, when the article is measured or weighed out to you from the bulk, and what you get in comparison in buying the same commodity when put up in the cartons, or containers. The disparity is very marked. It is therefore an extravagant method of buying food and it also facilitates fraud in not giving the proper amount as to weight or measurement in the carton. Nothing is promised, and therefore there is no contract. You buy a package and pay so much for it. This provision is simply to make it necessary that every container shall bear upon it legibly the net weight or measurement of the article that is contained therein. It is also made necessary by this legislation that the name of the packer or person who puts up the product, or of the person for whom it is put up, shall be marked on the container. There is an amendment I wish to make to the latter part of paragraph (b) which will make the meaning a little clearer. I beg to move:

That after the word "standard" in line 11, there be inserted these words "avoirdupois weight or the measure in Dominion standard".

The clause will then read:

"The name of the article or articles of food or other commodities in such container, and the net weight in Dominion standard avoirdupois weight, or the measure in Dominion standard capacity measure, or the numerical count of such food or other commodity."

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose the contents were half water, although the can contained the proper weight?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is whatever is contained within the carton if it is well and properly packed outside of the weight of the carton itself.

Mr. MORPHY: Suppose that in a can of tomato there was a large quantity of water, what protection has the public?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would have the protection of having the name of the