

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: The remaining three paragraphs of section 4 read this way:

- (e) if it is obtained from a diseased animal, or from an animal fed upon unwholesome food;
- (f) If it contains any added poisonous ingredient, or any ingredient which may render it injurious to the health of the person consuming it, whether added with intent or otherwise; or
- (g) If its strength or purity falls below the standard, or its constituents are present in quantity not within the limits of variability fixed by the Governor in Council as hereinafter provided.

Why have you dropped all that from the proposed new Act?

Dr. MORRELL: We have not dropped it at all, sir. I think that a lot of it is now written into section 4 of the bill, but it is not in the bill under the term "adulteration", because we felt it was not appropriate to refer to adulteration in those terms.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Well, if food is treated in any way of the ways referred to there, what is it if it is not adulterated?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: "Adulteration", in common parlance, means the adding of something.

Mr. CURRAN: Or taking something away.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I think that in common parlance it means the adding of something.

The CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Where is the definition of "adulteration" in the bill?

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: There is none. My point is that I think the definition should be provided by statute.

Dr. MORRELL: If butter is rancid, is it adulterated?

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I would say it is not. Under this definition it might be considered to be adulterated, but rancid butter, in ordinary parlance, is not adulterated.

Dr. MORRELL: Meat that is rotten is not adulterated.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: No.

Mr. CURRAN: We thought that the word "adulterated", used in a generic sense, was mis-descriptive of that kind of thing. The very essence of adulteration is the fraudulent addition of something or perhaps the fraudulent abstraction of something.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Let us take that as being 100 per cent correct. But because "adulteration" is mis-descriptive of some of the practices prohibited in section 4 of the present Act, you want the Governor in Council to be empowered to write the definition in his own terms. How does one argument flow from the other?

Mr. CURRAN: I do not want to seem disrespectful, senator, but the purpose of delegating to the Governor in Council the authority to define "adulteration" by regulation is that we recognize the difficulty of coining at the present time a definition which would be all-inclusive, which would cover exactly what we intended to be regarded as "adulteration" in relation to a particular food or class of foods, without doing violence to the term in relation to something else. The object was to give the flexibility which we think is desirable if we are going to make "adulteration" apply to those foods which are regarded as adulterated.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: That is, according to the departmental view?

Mr. CURRAN: I can only express the departmental view, sir.