

ject to inspection under this Act, unless the requirements of this Act and of the regulations regarding inspection and marking have been complied with, and every person offering any fish or shellfish for export or exporting the same shall furnish such proof with respect to inspection and marking as is required by the regulations, whether the fish or shellfish so offered for export or exported are subject to inspection or not.

It would seem, from the reading of those two sections together, that all packed lobsters must be marked with the name of the packer, and a description of the contents, and, unless this is done, it is not lawful to export them. I do not think there can be any doubt that that is the meaning of the regulation, however, I may be wrong.

Mr. HAZEN: Subsection 4 of section 2 gives power to the Governor in Council—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate to this Bill. It is not in order to discuss the Bill generally.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I may be out of order in referring to that matter, but it was brought up by the hon. member for Northumberland, and I thought it would be in order for me to make a few remarks in reply to him. On the question as to what the quantity in the can shall be, I am not able to give the House any special advice. I regret that I was not present at the time this Bill was introduced. It was considered by a special committee. The minister will see that the trade ought to be notified as to legislation of this kind. I should like to know from the minister, when we come to deal with this question in committee, what notice has been given to the trade. It may be a matter of great interest to them to decide what quantity of fish may be in a can, and, while members of the House may not know much about it, they should put their constituents in touch with what is going on here, and give them an opportunity to be heard from. I have not had the opportunity to communicate with my constituents, I was not aware that these changes were being made with regard to the quantity that was to be placed in a can, and I should like to know from the minister, when we go into committee, what steps have been taken to acquaint the trade with the contents of this Bill. I have no objection to the Bill, but I think it would be perhaps easier to deal with it if the House were moved into committee, and we were allowed to discuss the

[Mr. Sinclair.]

question, in order to obtain the information we require.

Motion agreed to and amendments made by the Senate concurred in.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Department of Railways and Canals—To provide for increase in salary of Departmental Solicitor to \$4,500, \$500; to provide for increase in salary of Assistant Chief Engineer in First Division, Subdivision A, to \$4,000, \$500; to provide for promotion of G. W. Yates to First Division, Subdivision A, at \$3,000, \$200; to provide for promotion of E. R. Williams to Second Division, Subdivision A, \$550; to provide for promotions from Subdivision A of the Third Division to Subdivision B of the Second Division to the following: B. C. Waddell \$200, W. T. O'Regan \$200, C. P. Buckley \$100, J. W. Weir \$100, F. W. Addy \$100, C. E. Bleakney \$100, \$800—\$2,550.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who is the departmental solicitor?

Mr. COCHRANE: Mr. Fairweather.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What salary is he getting now?

Mr. COCHRANE: \$4,000. He is an extra good man, and I am afraid I would not be able to keep him unless I raised his salary. Of course the Railway Department is under a different system from most of the other departments. It did not come under the Civil Service Act originally.

Mr. CARVELL: So far as this particular item is concerned I have no objection. I quite agree that this officer is more than an ordinarily good man, and I doubt if the minister would be able to obtain the services of an equally efficient man for any less money. I know nothing about the other items, except that the salaries which civil servants in Ottawa are receiving are so tremendously large, compared with the amount ordinary people outside of Ottawa are receiving in the way of salaries, that when we commence to make a comparison we are rather surprised. However I realize, so far as the position of chief solicitor of a department is concerned, that you require a big enough man to command a salary anywhere, and I believe you have that man in Mr. Fairweather.

Mr. COCHRANE: I may say the same with reference to Mr. Sherwood, Assistant Chief Engineer. He is an exceptionally bright man, who, I am satisfied, could command more than the salary he is receiving, if he went outside. Then I am increasing the salary of my secretary to an amount