

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Of course, and it is quite proper that you should do so. But there is another viewpoint, and it is that the general public should be able to read in the statute what is prohibited and what is not prohibited, and that this matter should not be decided in little pieces behind closed doors. I think that is the substance of Senator Hayden's objection, that parliament should determine what is meant by "adulteration", rather than that the question should be left in flux from time to time as you gentlemen of the department come to the conclusion that you should take another step forward or backward.

Hon. Mr. STAMBAUGH: Does not paragraph (g) of section 4 of the present Act give the department all the authority they are asking for in section 24 of the bill?

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: It gives them all the authority they need, yes.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes, paragraph (g) substantially does that, sir.

Hon. Mr. STAMBAUGH: Why should we not leave this in?

Mr. CURRAN: Of course, I am not going to discuss the actual language of paragraph (g), which is unfortunate, it is not well put together; but in our view a food for which a standard has been made, and which does not wholly conform to that standard, is not necessarily adulterated.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: The statute says it is adulterated.

Mr. CURRAN: The statute says it is. But no matter whether the departure is to improve the food, it is still adulterated. We think "adulterated" is not the proper word to use.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: But Mr. Curran, since you can provide the standard by regulations, if you think that a departure would adulterate the quality of the food, all you have to do is sit down and amend your regulations.

Mr. CURRAN: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Standards are things that you can remedy, but this is not.

Dr. MORRELL: There are more foods for which we do not have a standard than for which we have.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: And the reason you have not got a standard is, I assume, that you do not feel that a standard is necessary at the present time.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: What I do not like about section 24 (g) is that you can pick out some particular food, identify it, and go to the Governor in Council and get it declared—

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And goodbye to oleomargarine! By calling it adulterated, out it goes.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: I do not like the fact that you are not laying down a general principle and requiring the public to conform to it. You can pick out something without giving a man a chance to test in court as to whether he is under the definition or not, and you say "Here is something that ought to be put on the spot." In other words, you designate the food, and that is the end of it.

Mr. CURRAN: Perhaps it would be appropriate to say that the use of the word "adulteration" is going to be extremely limited under the proposed bill. There seems to me to be a feeling that perhaps under the guise of using the authority we make regulations, and get the word "adulteration" into areas where it has not been. Actually, the feeling of the administration is that there would be little use for "adulteration" except as to certain practices which do exist and do not squarely come within the other provisions of the bill. For