

must be the organization that borrows the money and advances it to the producer. The second part of Senator Connolly's question had reference to charges. There is nothing in the bill providing for any charges by the producer organization to the producer who seeks an advance. I am advised, however, that while the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, which has been on the statute books for some time, does not provide specifically for any charge, it is understood that the elevator companies may levy a small charge—I believe the maximum is \$5—if they wish to do so, to cover their cost of completing the documentation required for the advance itself.

● (2020)

There does not appear to be any clear pattern on the part of the elevator companies so far as that charge is concerned. I am advised that while some do charge it, others do not. There is certainly no obligation to do so under the act. It would appear that in most instances there is no charge. Presumably, the same rules would apply under this bill. If there were to be a charge, it would be a minimal one, and certainly there is no obligation to make such a charge. The purpose of Bill C-2 is to provide interest-free advances on storable crops. That being so, it would surely not provide at the same time for a substantial charge in respect of such advances.

Although the experience under the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act was not raised specifically during the course of the debate, it might be useful if I were to outline some of the history. The Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, of course, has been exceedingly successful. As proof, one need only look at the figures, particularly in the first year of operation. At that time there were 190,000 permit book holders in the area covered by the Canadian Wheat Board, 122,000 of whom applied for advance payments under the act. It was obvious from the response that the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act was badly needed, and that it filled a vacuum in providing cash advances to farmers at a time of substantial difficulty in marketing their crops because of world grain conditions. It is interesting to note, too, that the amount of default has been very small indeed. Advances in that first year totalled more than \$272 million, covering a total crop value of \$853 million, and the default on those advances amounted to only \$734,000.

In the year 1974-75, which is the latest year for which figures are available, out of 159,000 permit book holders, only 14,000 applied for advances. Some \$46 million was advanced in that year to prairie grain farmers under the interest-free provisions of that act. Again, the number of defaults remained low.

The Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act became law some nine years ago, and has proved successful. It has satisfied a serious need in the area covered by the Canadian Wheat Board. This new law, which extends to other crops and to all of Canada, will, I am sure, meet needs in the same way when marketing conditions may be difficult for certain crops, or in the peak season when the transportation system is unable to cope with the sudden increase of produce on the market.

Honourable senators, I am pleased that there has been general support expressed by those who have spoken on second

reading. It is my hope that the bill will be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture, where officials of the Department of Agriculture will be available to go into further details.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

On motion of Senator Molgat, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture.

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SCIENCE

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO STUDY BAN ON USE OF SACCHARIN—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate resumed from Wednesday, April 27, the debate on the motion of Senator Buckwold that the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science be authorized to inquire into and report upon the proposed ban on the use of saccharin.

Hon. Joseph A. Sullivan: Honourable senators, it is not in any perfunctory manner that I wish to express to you my sincere thanks for your indulgence in allowing me to postpone this debate so that I might more adequately present my views on this subject.

Before coming to the main theme of my presentation, I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the Leader of the Government and my own deputy leader, Senator Grosart, for their kind remarks pertaining to myself a week ago. To you, Madam Speaker, I offer my warm respects and to all the new senators I also offer my felicitations. As the ranks of the government have been so badly depleted they need to be reinforced.

Having said that I will be very explicit and brief. I will define one word, the word "mutation." In biology we mean by that a permanent transmissible change in the characteristics of an offspring from those of its parent.

● (2030)

As one who has been personally engaged in experimental medical research for years on both rats and dogs and on rhesus monkeys, I was astounded when I heard and read the dogmatic conclusions of the Department of National Health and Welfare, which they arrived at as a result of simple experiments on rats, of what they propose to do to the Canadian population. Immediately, the Federal Drug Administration in Washington followed suit. Why? Because of a law on their books which has not been changed since 1958.

I wish to congratulate Senator Buckwold on a most able presentation, and an accumulation of medical references that do him credit. But I was also in agreement with my colleague, Senator Grosart, when in no uncertain terms he refuted Senator Buckwold's attempt—and this is the only mistake I find in Senator Buckwold's presentation—his attempt to chastise the