

*Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act*

I do not think it is anything as malicious as that. I think it is probably just a tradition. It may be that the original Mr. Kellogg who invented cornflakes was a baker, and to be generous he threw in an extra ounce with every half-pound, three-quarter pound and pound of cornflakes, the same as it had been their tradition to throw in an extra bun with a dozen to make it a baker's dozen. Nevertheless, I think it is reasonable that container sizes should be not only in round figures, eliminating fractions, but that amounts should be easily divisible by two, three and five. Therefore, I think that the amendment of the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre has some merit.

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** I wonder if the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) would answer a question. I was interested in the hon. member's suggestion that the baker's dozen prevails in the case of Kellogg's cornflakes. I was in Prince Edward Island a year ago and I am wondering if the same thing would apply to Malpeque oysters which one buys in Charlottetown.

**Mr. MacLean:** Yes, I think it would, in the case of the hon. member.

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, there are many commendable features in this amendment, but I think the minister summed it up very well when he said that clause 9 takes good care of this point. For that reason I would not support the amendment. But I would like to refute some things that have been said tonight. I think that my good friends to the left are overlooking one thing. I would like them to think about the fact that by stopping the abuses, a very small number of them, we may kill the free market. I think it would be a sad situation if the free market were killed by our introducing legislation just to take care of a few abuses. My friend, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), wants to standardize packages in his amendment.

**Mr. Benjamin:** No quantities.

**Mr. Hales:** Yes, quantities and packages. If you want to do this, the manufacturer and the processor will tell you, as they told us in committee that you must be prepared to pay more for the product. So this piece of legislation will cost Mrs. Consumer more money all along the line. I put the following question to every processor that appeared before the committee: If you bring in a standardized package and you do what the legislation calls for, will it cost the consumer more money? In every case the answer was yes. So with all the window-dressing and great noise about this legislation, it will cost Mrs. Consumer more money; there is no doubt about it.

Let us say that a box is  $8\frac{1}{2}$  inches by  $2\frac{3}{4}$  inches by  $12\frac{1}{2}$  inches. That is a standard box. Let us say that you put cornflakes in one box, grape nuts in another and puffed wheat in the third. You will then have 16 ounces of cornflakes, 3 pounds 15 ounces of grape nuts and 9 ounces of puffed wheat. So you will have a greater prolif-

[Mr. MacLean.]

eration of fractional weights than we have now. If you put 12 ounces of each of these products in a package you will have three sizes of boxes, one that will be very small, another medium and the third a tall one. So the density of the product which goes into a standard box creates a real problem and a proliferation of odd ounces. It will add to the cost, because when a cereal manufacturer has a packaging machine which can run three boxes through, the small, the medium and the large, and he runs the cornflakes through, this is one operation; but if you want the boxes to be standardized, as this amendment proposes—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

#### FINANCE—BANKRUPTCY—MEASURES TO FORESTALL FURTHER BUSINESS FAILURES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, on February 3, which now seems a long time ago, I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) about the very depressing statistics released by Dun and Bradstreet a short time earlier. The Canadian Press, in the *Journal Pioneer* of January 30, set out in some detail the further chapter in what is becoming a familiar economic threnody in this country. It reads as follows:

#### MANY BUSINESSES FAIL

More than 2,200 businesses failed in Canada during 1970 compared with 1,861 the year before, a recent survey shows.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Dun and Bradstreet of Canada Ltd., Toronto, said Quebec led with 1,155 failures compared with 944 a year earlier.

Liabilities totalled \$264,894,000 compared with \$145,701,000 in 1969.

In Ontario, there were 797 failures compared with 618 a year earlier.

On these dismal and dreary statistics there seems to be no device whereby seasonal adjustment can be integrated. It is sad to relate that so many visionary aspects of the once proudly hailed just society emerged as dreary, dark realities. With an unemployment rate growing to painful and disgraceful proportions we have a blighting of economic opportunities for our young people in and out of university. Further takeovers of Canadian businesses both at home and abroad, now that Guyana has closed in on one of our important business establishments without much more than a slight flickering eyebrow from the Canadian government, are situations which should cause us concern.

Slump, decline, pessimism are too often the hallmarks of our present economic state. Not surprising then, sir, that cold, hard statistics like those just quoted give the dimensions of the economic mess created by a government