

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: He does not purport to have a supply of this stuff that he is selling himself.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: He may own stock in a company that is selling it.

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable senators, we have had a lengthy and illuminating discussion on this particular clause and I think the two senators who wished to express their views have done so in a very clear way. What is your desire at the present time with respect to this clause? Do you wish to accept it as it was—

Hon. Mr. HAWKINS: It has been accepted.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to confirm, rather?

Hon. Mr. STAMBAUGH: I think so.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: I am not going to move an amendment.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: For my part, if this word "treatment" were being considered today for the first time I would be a little reluctant to support it. On the other hand, I do not agree with my colleague, Senator Hayden, that time is no factor. If this has been tried for eighteen years and there has been no abuse of it, I would leave sleeping dogs lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the committee so desire to confirm this clause as accepted?

Some Hon. SENATORS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: There is one other item that we want to speak about, and I refer to section 24. I should like to make a representation with respect to that.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether we can reach section 24 today or not. Would it be the desire of the committee to take up section 24 now?

Hon. Mr. BURCHILL: Yes, let these lawyers finish. They are doing a big job with the Criminal Code Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: The point I want to make in connection with section 24 is this, that in the present act you have a definition by statute as to adulteration. Now what this proposes to do is that the Governor in Council can make definition by regulation of what constitutes adulteration, and he can vary it from time to time. Now, to me, the definition of "adulteration" is something that is basic and fundamental, and I think a broad outline of it, at least, should be in the statute; there should be a statutory definition. The present act has worked all right. If I may use my friend Senator Farris' argument, it has been in force for a long time. You have a definition of "adulteration" in the act, by statute, and then, by regulation, the standards of quality are provided and the degrees of variability. Now, what it is proposed to do here is to remove the defining of "adulteration" from the scope of Parliament and put it in the hands of the Governor in Council. We lose the effective control over what shall constitute a basic and fundamental definition. I think that is inherently wrong. I think Parliament should write the definition, and I think the Department by regulation can provide standards arising out of that definition and they can provide degrees of variability. But to give them the full control of what the definition shall be,—I am not prepared to do that.

Dr. MORRELL: I would like to ask Mr. Curran to speak to it, but I might say that the definition of "adulteration" in the present act does apply only to foods, and we think we should have some authority to control adulteration in drugs, as well as cosmetics.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: I am not objecting to a definition that you may put in the act, when I can see what it is and what is the extent of it. I am not suggesting