

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The contemplated change in the law will not relieve the packer from the consequences of his putting up any product in the form of canned goods in an improper shape. But, in the trade, it has been found that the wholesale man who buys from the packers wants his name and label on the package, instead of the packer's name. It is only an addition to the law, and does not relieve the packer who is guilty of any infraction. Under the Act of 1907, if the packer does not conform to all the regulations, he is liable to have his license cancelled.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Wherein would that apply to the packer? If you release the packer—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—We do not release him at all. We simply permit the wholesale man to have his label on the can, but the packer is still liable.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It is an alternative. As the law now stands, the packer must mark his packages in a certain way, and it seems to me that substituting the dealer for the packer is vicious in this regard. The dealer, for the purpose of obtaining a cheap article, may induce the packer to put up inferior goods. The dealer says, 'I will take the responsibility by placing my name on the package.' The packer is not bound to disclose to the public who the packer was. That will be followed by this evil effect; under the existing law there is an obligation on the packer to disclose to the public who put up the goods. There is therefore an incentive to put up a superior class of goods, so that his name shall be identified with that particular brand. If he, through this law, can substitute isolated dealers who assume the responsibility of the inferior goods put up by him, withholding from the public his personality, the public in that way will obtain an inferior brand of goods, because the packer is not concerned about maintaining his reputation with the public by packing a superior brand. It seems to me that would be the logical working out of the law as proposed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—My hon. friend is under a misapprehension. All the provisions of the Act still apply to the packer; they are not repealed.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—The best assurance the public has of the quality of goods is through the label of the packer being upon the can or package. How is the public to set in motion the law, except there is some motive as to who originally was responsible for the packing of inferior goods? The dealer may not have any standing in the community, may not be known, may have little interest in the community commercially or otherwise. I therefore say the best assurance the public can have of the superior quality of goods, is through the name of the packer being upon the original package. When the government introduced those amendments in the House of Commons, they were opposed to the package being marked by the dealers. They wanted the original packer to put his brand upon the package, and it was only through influence of the dealers brought to bear on the government, after the introduction of the Bill, that this important departure was made. I think it will be found that the opinion of the department itself was that the package should continue to bear the brand of the dealer. I am not saying that the packer is relieved of the liability, if the law is set in motion to inquire who the original packer was; but, in the meantime, you absolve him from the necessity of having his brand on the package.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Last year, when the Bill was introduced in the first instance, it went the utmost length of insisting that the name of the packer should be on the goods. I think it was after the Bill came to this House that some modification was made in that respect. That modification was called for both from the east and from the west. In the lower provinces, the lobster trade runs in this way; the agents of the large dealers in Europe insist upon buying the article which is manufactured for them without the label of the local packer being upon it, in order that they may use their own label. I know that is the trend of the lobster business in the east, and I think my hon. friend from British Columbia voiced the same opinion with reference to the salmon trade of that province. What happened was that in this House power was given to the Governor in Council to modify the Act in order to meet the absolute requirements of trade both in British