

the regular supply of labels would be used up.

But, even supposing the label is one that can be printed, what would be the consequence of printing that label in the case of canned goods? At present the manufacturer has a great number of varieties that he packs. For instance, take Heinz's pickles: he advertises fifty-seven varieties. That means that he has to make fifty-seven different labels, and keep them at fifty-seven different places or bins, which would be enough for anybody to look after. But perhaps Heinz has twenty different sizes, so he must get twenty times fifty-seven different kinds of labels, or a total of eleven hundred kinds, and that means eleven hundred boxes in which to keep those labels. A girl would waste as much time in getting those labels as she would occupy in putting them on the packages. Those are all extra costs, which will certainly come back on the consumer.

It is said that the cost of putting on an extra label is not much; people say: "Oh, that does not amount to anything; put on a sticker." Let us see what it will cost. There are consumed annually in this country not less than 120,000,000 tins of canned goods alone; I do not know how many packages of pickles and other products are sold, but I should say probably as many more; making a total of 240,000,000 tins of goods sold in this country; which, according to this Bill, will have to be marked, in most cases requiring an extra label. A girl at \$1.50 a day can put on, at the outside, labels for 100 cases, or 2,400 tins. It would take at least \$150,000 in wages alone of the girls putting on the extra label for the packages of food that are sold in this country.

As I said at the outset, I would prefer that method if there were no other way, to protect the consumer. But there is a better way. How will this Bill protect the consumer? Imagine a woman going into a store to buy a tin of jam. The storekeeper shows one at seventy-five cents. She wants to know whether that is a good purchase or not, so she looks at the label and finds that it contains 3 pounds 13 ounces, and she asks, "How much is that a pound?" And she does a sum in arithmetic if she can—and there would not be more than one in ten who could do it. Even then she is not sure; she wants to know how that tin compares with another that contains 4 lbs. 3 ounces, which is offered at 85 cents; so she goes through another arithmetical calculation, in which she consumes time

and makes mistakes, and which only one woman in ten would try to make, and she is not sure even after she has made that mental effort. That mental effort applied to the 240,000,000 tins that are sold in Canada in a year, could all be saved by adopting a different system.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Could not a packer put up his tins in one or two or three-pound weights?

Hon. Mr. SMITH: That is exactly it; that is what I was coming to. Standardize the packages; cut out all those numerous sizes; consult with the manufacturers as to what the public really needs. In jams at the present time there are from ten to twenty different sizes of packages. These are not necessary, but they exist because some dishonest manufacturer wants to get his size of package a little bit under the other fellow, and he makes one holding two or three ounces less. I am engaged in the jam business, and I know that several years ago, a 7-lb. tin of jam was called the standard, but someone thought that was too much, and he got it down to 5 lb.; then another put up a package containing 4½ lb. instead of 5; the next year another went one better, and put it at 4½ lb.; then it became ridiculous, and another put up a 4-lb. tin; later it was reduced to 3½ lb., and now it is 3½ lb. which the public is getting. The object of this Bill is to cure that evil, but there would not be much benefit from marking the net weight on the package. Instead of that, suppose the Government said: "There shall be only two sizes of tins of jam—2-lb and 4-lb., and there shall always be 2 lb. of jam in one and 4 lb. in the other." Then the public could not possibly be cheated. I would ask any honourable gentleman who objects to that method how the public could be deceived or cheated if that were done. There is no possible way; and all that mental effort I described would be unnecessary. All a woman would have to do would be to buy a tin of jam, and she would know she was getting the exact quantity, and she would get the same quantity in every store, whether she went to a dozen or a hundred.

Hon. Mr. WEBSTER: Could you make that apply all through the Bill?

Hon. Mr. SMITH: I do not know that it could be done in this Bill, but the Department of Agriculture have prepared a system of standards, a most particular and elaborate system, not only for standard tins, but for the quality of the goods.