

and not coming into force until December, 1918. He says that we were all wrong then and that we should go back to the time when the lobster packers were imposing upon the consumer a one-pound can which, as my hon. friend stated to-night, contained only twelve or sometimes thirteen ounces. Until we have further information, this committee should not be asked to pass this resolution, nor the House to pass the Bill to be founded on it.

Mr. LOGGIE: I presume the hon. member (Mr. Copp) was a member of the Marine and Fisheries Committee when they asked this House to pass the legislation making the net weight thirteen ounces. That recommendation for a thirteen-ounce can came from the Marine and Fisheries Committee. When it came before this House, I was absent. This House changed the weight, making it sixteen ounces, and sent the Bill up to the Senate. The Senate rejected it, and it came back to this House, and the weight was compromised at fourteen ounces. Thus it became effective on the day the hon. gentleman has mentioned. Let me tell the Committee why this legislation is asked for.

Mr. COPP: That is what we are endeavouring to find out.

Mr. LOGGIE: A number of years ago, Parliament passed an Act to provide that all canned goods should bear a statement of net weight.

Mr. COPP: When was that passed?

Mr. LOGGIE: I cannot recall exactly, but it was quite a number of years ago. I am not sure whether the net weight was to be on the can or not, but the name of the firm was to be set out on the label. On account of that and because of legislation in the United States that compelled all packers to put on the label the net contents of the can, it became desirable that a similar law should become effective in Canada.

Mr. COPP: Was that after reciprocity was defeated or before?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In what year was reciprocity defeated?

Mr. LOGGIE: I can recall in what year reciprocity was defeated, but that has nothing to do with this matter. The reason for this legislation is that the Department of Marine and Fisheries have asked that a standard weight be made law as to the net contents of a can of lobster.

Mr. COPP: We have that now.

Mr. LOGGIE: My hon. friend is asking why this legislation was asked for. I am pointing out that the demand came from the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. COPP: And we answered the demand.

Mr. LOGGIE: The Marine and Fisheries Committee in 1917, recommended thirteen ounces. The House, however, made the net weight sixteen ounces, and in the Senate this was changed to fourteen ounces. The acting minister spoke of six cans the net contents of not one of which weighed fourteen ounces. There is a difference of two ounces in some cases. The object of this legislation is to have a uniform weight. Personally, I have no objection to the law as it now stands, but the majority of the large packers when they met in Halifax decided that twelve ounces should be the standard weight.

Mr. COPP: That is more profitable for them than sixteen ounces.

Mr. LOGGIE: The selling price is based on the net contents. This legislation has been in contemplation for some time, and some of the packers have their labels marked at fourteen ounces—

Mr. COPP: What right had they to assume that Parliament would pass this legislation?

Mr. LOGGIE: Fourteen ounces is the weight under the present law. I have already told my friend that the law in the United States requires the net weight to be shown on the label on every can of lobster entering the United States for consumption there. That has been the law for some years, and when we were getting labels we naturally had the net weight shown on them. So far as the company in which I am interested is concerned, the net weight on the label is fourteen ounces for the pound can, and seven ounces for the half-pound. Personally, I favour fourteen ounces, but I am willing to bow to the wishes of the majority.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend is prepared to lose the money he has spent on labels, because of the extra profit he will make by reason of the reduction of the net contents of the can by two ounces.

Mr. LOGGIE: I am extremely obliged for the hon. gentleman's interpretation. After all, it is not a very serious matter to have the labels stamped. I have been in