

the unfortunate situation of sending cans into the United States without the net weight being shown on the labels and have had to remove the cans from the boxes and have them stamped—the existing law was not in effect in the United States when we had the labels made. If Parliament prescribes the weight in this case to be twelve ounces, I shall be very glad to conform to the law, although I prefer the fourteen-ounce can. Many years ago there seemed to be a demand for what we call dry lobster, but conditions have changed and the trade now seems to want a lobster with some liquid in the can. The mode of packing is changed from time to time to conform with the public's taste. The hon. gentleman knows that in the lobster itself there is some liquid, and now the packers put in half an ounce or an ounce of pickle, because the can would not be acceptable to buyers without some liquid.

Mr. COPP: The hon. gentleman has not answered my question with regard to the reduction in the contents by two ounces.

Mr. LEGER: The reasons advanced for this legislation do not satisfy me of its necessity. Why cannot a can be made to hold sixteen ounces of lobster? If the present cans are not large enough, why not make larger cans? In the district from which I come lobsters are bought by the pound, and if the weight in the can is to be reduced to twelve ounces, the consumer will lose two or three ounces on every pound he buys. Furthermore, what consideration is being given to the fisherman? The packers when buying from the fishermen demand sixteen ounces to the pound. It would seem to me that the consumer has been defrauded of a few ounces on every can he has bought for a great many years. I used to think I was getting a pound of lobster when I bought one of these cans, but now I find I was being cheated out of two or three ounces every time. One would think a lobster was one of the precious metals, which weigh twelve ounces to the pound. I think we should fix a standard weight, and if the cans the packers are now using will not hold a pound let them make larger cans, rather than pass eleven or twelve ounces off for a pound.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not think the minister ought to press the resolution after the discussion we have just heard. The main reason he gives us is that you could not get more than fourteen ounces, or at least more than twelve ounces, properly into a can. My hon. friend from Northumberland, who is a well known pack-

[Mr. Loggie.]

er and who knows the trade as well as any man in the Maritime Provinces, is able to put fourteen ounces into the can. He does not say you cannot put fourteen ounces in, and his view is evidently directly opposed to that of the minister. We are told that the packers from the Maritime Provinces met in Halifax and decided that a twelve ounce can would be better than a fourteen ounce can. Why? Because they would save that much of the meat. They will not sell that can for one cent less than the can containing fourteen ounces. I have just been making a calculation, and on the pack in the Maritime Provinces, they will save no less than about \$400,000 if this Bill passes, while the consumer will lose to that extent. Now, that is why the packers were unanimous in the matter. Of course, they would be unanimous! And next year they might be unanimous in the opinion that ten ounces would be sufficient to put into a pound can. These arguments do not convince me at all, and I do not believe they convince the minister. I think this matter ought to be delayed until further investigation has been made. Questions of this kind are generally referred to the Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend might have patience enough until there is something to refer to the committee. It was my intention, and still is, that the Bill should go to the committee.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: But the resolution?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The resolution cannot go to the committee; my hon. friend knows that. When the Bill is introduced it will go to the committee.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If we pass this resolution it means that we have consented to the principle of the Bill, and that is the reason I ask that the resolution be withdrawn.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that inasmuch as a Bill similar to this, when introduced in 1917, was sent to the Committee on Fisheries, it will be only proper that this proposed Bill should go to the same committee. But you cannot manufacture a Bill in a minute. Unfortunately the rules of Parliament demand—and without any good purpose, in my opinion—that a Bill of this character should be preceded by a resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the reason?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Oh, I do not want to go into that question just now; but gen-