

This same point was raised by the Fisheries Association of British Columbia. It was raised by the Vancouver Fish Dealers Association, and it was raised by the Prairie Fisheries Federation at a meeting I had with them in Winnipeg on July 5, 1965.

In each instance, we explained the use of the words "aesthetically offensive" as an all-embracing term which covers all kinds of other descriptions, such as that used in the Food and Drug regulations which reads:

consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, disgusting, rotten, decomposed or diseased animal or vegetable substance.

It was our view that the words "aesthetically offensive" would include all of these terms, because we interpret "aesthetically offensive" as something offending one of the human senses. No other interpretation can be placed upon it. There is no question of beauty. It offends the human senses, such as someone's smell, sight, or taste, in some way.

**Senator Cook:** As I understand it, the word "wholesome" is in the bill, and there is no doubt that the definition can be amended or improved after discussions between the department and the trade. As I see it, and subject to other views, we would do well to pass the section as it is now, and agree with the witnesses that the word "wholesome" should be better defined after there has been a meeting of minds between the department and the industry. If that is agreeable to the committee I would move that the bill be reported.

**Senator Blois:** I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, in order to satisfy people in my province, whether that could be changed before this bill is passed. I can see your point, sir. You did not get any reports from them because they thought the bill contained what was in their minds. I do not have any letters from them authorizing me to speak, but I have heard from one of the leading members of the Fish Packers Association, and also from some of the small fishing plants, to the effect that they take serious objection to this, and they were hoping there would be some word which would not give them cause to complain.

I think in all of the letters I have received the question they asked was: Who is going to decide what is "aesthetically offensive"? They ask this because to many people, and particularly the ladies, most of these things,

if you speak about them in the sense of art of beauty, would be offensive, but that does not mean that they are not mighty good eating and good food.

I wonder if you could clarify this in any way, because it would make people feel better. People today, you know, have the idea that we members of parliament have a tendency to make things as difficult for them as they can. I do not intend to make any fuss about it, but can we not make it easier for people to understand?

**Mr. Carton:** It is not difficult, but when you ask: "Why do we not change it immediately?" I would point out that we do not ever change any of our fish inspection legislation without consulting the industry. This is not an immediate process. It has to be circulated through their head offices, and it takes a bit of time. If we can come up with something that would be suitable then certainly I think the department would be prepared to investigate it, but to say that we will put something before the Governor in Council within a week or two—well, that is just not practical.

**Senator McDonald:** Senator Cook has proposed that the bill be reported, and that the officials of the department, after hearing the discussion this morning, would endeavour to search out a better word.

**Senator Cook:** After consultation with the industry.

**Senator McDonald:** As we have been told, it is not possible to do this within the next day or two because of the practice of consulting with the industry before changes are made. I think that this is a good procedure, and that we should adopt it. Surely, we can rely on the officials of the department to read the evidence that has been given, and to pay some attention to it.

**Mr. Carton:** And remember this, that the changes you are speaking of are not changes in the legislation. They will be incorporated in the regulations that come out of the legislation, if we can come up with something acceptable to the industry and ourselves.

**Senator Cameron:** Could we not re-define this word "aesthetically" as it is used in the regulations?

**Mr. Carton:** That would be a solution, yes.

**Senator Prowse:** What would be the situation were somebody to use the enzymatic