

spectively of dry lobster meat. Further, each can must have a label giving the name of the packer, and the exact quantity of lobster meat that the can contains. Now, we have never had legislation before to that effect. I think that such legislation is eminently desirable and proper.

Mr. DUFF: If these cans are marked, will they be marked "1 pound" or "12 ounces?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will be marked 12 ounces, 9 ounces, 6 ounces, 3 ounces. Heretofore the cans have been known as pound cans, three-quarter-pound cans, half-pound cans and one-quarter-pound cans. These designations have been misleading to the consuming public, for the cans do not contain that exact amount of lobster meat, for the reason that in the export trade the cans must contain a certain amount of liquid as a preservative. The principle of the legislation is, therefore, to compel canners to use not more than four different sizes of cans without the written permission of the minister. These cans must contain a definite minimum amount of lobster meat, the amount to be stated on the label. Therefore, from the standpoint of the public and of the consumer, the legislation is fair and should have been enacted long ago. My hon. friend says that the Bill of 1917 did not become effective until December 15 of last year. That is quite true, but the legislation was suspended, not for the reason that he gives, but because the canners had on hand a large quantity of labels and wanted to dispose of them before the Act came into effect. The same is true of British Columbia. Certain canning industries there are compelled by virtue of the Canned Foods Act to print upon the labels additional matter; they still have on their hands a considerable quantity of old labels and they desire that the application of the Act be postponed until the labels which they now have on hand are used.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the weight of the dry meat is to be stated on the label, the present labels would not be suitable; they would have to be re-printed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, if the legislation is changed, new labels will probably have to be printed. However, that is not important. Under the statute of 1917, every canner of fish must apply to the can a label setting forth a true and correct description of the contents of the can, including the vernacular name and the minimum net weight of the fish in the can

plainly printed in a conspicuous manner, and stating the name of the place where the same was packed. Now, the canners have been using a standard can for a long number of years. That standard can is known to the Canadian trade and to the export trade, and naturally the canners do not wish to change its size. They say—and I believe it is true,—that they cannot get into this can fourteen ounces of lobster meat without doing danger to the meat. It may be done in some cases, but in the majority of the cases it is not done, and the purchaser thinks that he is buying sixteen ounces of lobster meat. The canner asks that he be permitted to place in these cans the amount of lobster meat which the can will reasonably hold. The public are protected in the fact that the canner must state upon the label the exact amount of lobster meat in the can.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did the request for this legislation come from the exporters, or from the consuming public?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Well, I suppose it originated with the lobster canners. I have informed the committee of the action of the fisheries convention at Halifax, at which it was decided that legislation should be introduced as set forth in the resolution. It cannot be said that this legislation is in the interest of the canners only; it is equally in the interest of the consuming public.

Mr. COPP: Apparently my hon. friend has misunderstood my argument in regard to this matter. I understand that this proposed legislation, except in so far as it reduces the amount of dry lobster meat to be placed in the cans, does not change the legislation of 1917. My hon. friend's suggestion that we should have this legislation in order to secure uniformity, is not an answer to my argument. The point I make is that we now have this legislation on the statute book; why make the change?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: For this reason: The statute of 1917 provided that a pound can should contain fourteen ounces of lobster meat; the trade says that is impossible. If the trade is right in its representation, the amendment is a proper one.

Mr. COPP: What evidence can the minister give the committee that the trade is right in stating that fourteen ounces of lobster meat cannot be put into a pound can?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have already given my hon. friend the reasons. At a conference attended by the lobster canners of the Maritime provinces and technical offi-