

Mr. ELLIOTT: Unless the minister agrees with my suggestion I am not going to say any more; I will simply move the amendment that I think will give the section the meaning the minister says it intends to have. The Minister of Justice has quite properly stated the rule and by his statement has made it quite clear, I submit, that this does not include any other receptacle or covering of a kind or sort different from those previously mentioned. I take it that I am correctly interpreting his views.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, I think so.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Now the Minister of Agriculture says he does not intend to include any receptacle of a kind or sort different from what is already mentioned, that is, box, paper wrapper or carton.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But the word "box" would include any kind of box. It does not have to be of wood or paper.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Quite so, and "carton" would mean any kind of carton, while "paper wrapping" might mean any kind of paper wrapping. Then there are other things that might be included, and they are intended to be covered by the latter clause, but that cannot cover them unless the words I suggest are inserted.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We may be at cross purposes, but I must say that I think the language of the bill as it appears now is ample for all purposes, and I do not see any advantage in adding to it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Might I just ask the Minister of Justice whether, in his opinion, this clause is broad enough to include any covering that is neither a box, a paper wrapper or a carton.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What is the reason for the difference in the two descriptions of a package? Why leave out some things in this description of a package which are included in the other description?

Mr. GUTHRIE: One description is in part 1 of the bill and the other is in part 2; that is all I can say.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The reason has been given a number of times this afternoon, not only by myself but also by the hon. member for Melville. It is a matter of practice, in describing packages, to enumerate some, and because all cannot be foreseen the phrase "or any other receptacle" is added to cover those not specified. Nothing could be clearer than that.

[Mr. R. Weir.]

Mr. VENIOT: If I understood the Minister of Justice correctly he said, in answer to my question as to why the words tub, crock and tin were left out of part 2, that I was presupposing a reason. I have been presupposing a reason right along. There must be some reason for having left out those words in part 2.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): No reason whatever.

Mr. VENIOT: Then why not insert them and end all this discussion?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): There would be no gain in inserting them.

Mr. VENIOT: I do not want to use this term offensively, but if the minister is so stubborn that he will not listen to the opinions of others who feel that they are aggrieved under this section I do not see any use at all in bringing a bill of this kind before the committee.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I think it will be agreed by hon. members of the committee that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is perhaps in the best position of any member of the house to understand the meaning of the word stubborn. I take no offence, therefore, from the remarks he has made. All I say is that in my estimation this includes as much as is included in the definition in part 1.

Mr. VENIOT: It does not.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Would the hon. gentleman indicate what is not included in part 2 that is included in part 1? "Any other receptacle" would include tubs, crocks and the other articles not named in part 2 but named in part 1.

Mr. VENIOT: Then why leave them out?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): As I have stated a number of times, it is a matter of custom in defining anything of this kind to specify some and include the general statement afterwards.

Mr. VENIOT: Not when the definition appears twice in the same act.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I move that the subsection be amended by adding after the word "carton" the words "and without restricting the generality of the foregoing."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Just before that amendment is put I should like to say a word. I have no doubt that this amendment is correctly drawn up from a legal point of view, but I have always taken the view that we should use as few legal terms and classical