

the goods were really canned, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to assure consumers that those marks will represent accurately the years in which the goods were put up.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not hear the Minister distinctly. Does the hon. gentleman intend to have the weight marked on the can?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Then do you intend to allow foreign goods to be imported here without the weight being marked and yet oblige home producers to have the weight marked?

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend behind me was under the impression that the Minister had been speaking generally as to foreign goods imported here. I understood the Minister to say that the exception as to weight is to apply only to such foreign goods imported as are not of the same character as we put up in this country.

Mr. DAVIES. With respect to the packing of lobsters, I suppose the Minister intends that those who pack lobsters for export do not need to stamp the cans, while any cans of lobsters attempted to be sold here must be stamped. I would impress on the hon. gentleman the supreme importance of obtaining accurate information before he legislates. Last year we passed what was nothing more than a tentative measure, and it turned out that it was not capable of being enforced. A good many packers went to a large expense in providing dies and casts for stamping cans, and afterwards they received notice from the Department that the Act would not be enforced. The hon. Minister shakes his head; but I can give him one case from my own personal knowledge. Packers, I say, went to the expense of providing dies and were then informed by the Department that the Act would not be enforced. The Minister admits that such was the case; it was not enforced as a matter of fact last year. If new regulations are made this year it is very desirable that they should be contained in the Statute itself, because if they are to be made by Order in Council they will be changed from time to time, and the trade will be interfered with. Nothing annoys any trade so much as constant changes of regulations. I submit that the hon. gentleman should satisfy himself on every point before he introduces legislation, and regulations should not be made by Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS. Looking at the Statutes of 1879—I was unable to obtain the Statutes for 1884—I find it is provided that 25 Imperial gallons shall be a barrel. That is made by law the capacity of a barrel without reference to the particular use to which the barrel is put. That provision would apply, of course, to apples as well as to anything else. Will the hon. gentleman state what is the capacity of the barrel which he now proposes to adopt; is it 25 Imperial gallons?

Mr. BLAKE. Will it be larger or smaller than 25 Imperial gallons? In fact, how many Imperial gallons will the new barrel hold?

Mr. COSTIGAN. A flour barrel, I suppose, will hold about three and a half bushels.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Nothing like it.

Mr. BLAKE. The Act provides 25 Imperial gallons shall be a barrel. How many Imperial gallons will the new barrel hold?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can measure it if the hon. gentleman wishes. It is provided by this Bill that a barrel shall be of certain dimensions.

Mr. BLAKE. We should like to know how much it will hold. We know how much 25 Imperial gallons is.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It would be nearly 25 Imperial gallons.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that the matter of weights and measures is getting each year into greater and greater confusion. We have adopted, as a measure of capacity, the Imperial gallon, and in addition we have said that 60 pounds of wheat shall be a bushel. A Winchester bushel will measure 60 pounds, but an Imperial bushel will measure 70 pounds. The weights of the various kinds of grain mentioned are based upon the Winchester bushel and not on the Imperial bushel, which is mentioned in the Act. We shall see when the Bill comes down what its provisions are; but there could not be a greater mass of confusion and inconsistency than the provisions of the Act relating to weights and measures.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose there is no more coal in the Bill than in the resolution.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is coal in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that fair?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### INSPECTION OF GAS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of gas and gas meters by providing that gas may be inspected without notice to the manufacturer.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman throw a little electric light on this subject?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I shall be most happy. The only change proposed is that in inspecting gas and gas meters, instead of giving notice to the owners or manufacturers, as at present, we may make the inspection of gas without any such notice.

Mr. BLAKE. We have lost the last part of the clause?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman never had it.

Mr. BLAKE. We had notice of it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I hope the hon. gentleman does not insist on my moving it.

Mr. BLAKE. No, if the hon. gentleman does not wish to move it.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not intend to make any further provision respecting the presence of sulphuretted hydrogen in gas. This is I suppose a sort of compensation for the superfluity of the other Bill. The question as to the quantity of sulphuretted hydrogen was the subject of debate and of attempted legislation some time ago, and I thought the hon. gentleman was about to deal with it. Is this postponement on account of the difficulty of dealing with the subject, or the representation of the gas companies, or perhaps because the consumers do not like such a proposal?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We thought it advisable at first to require the number of meters in use to be entered in the registers of consumers, but we learned from the reports of