

safety matters—about 1,000 persons in all—of the potential hazard associates with cribs incorporating these design features. Manufacturers and importers were asked to examine the design of their products and to eliminate voluntarily those features that could cause problems. A deadline for comments was set for September, 1980. Only three replies were received.

● (2220)

The director then wrote to the heads of 58 companies known to manufacture or import cribs requesting that their cribs be viewed as safety devices and that, voluntarily, they eliminate purely decorative features such as finials and posts that could put a child's life in jeopardy.

From the 27 replies received, it appeared that, in general, the industry was looking for specific guidance from the department. Colonial-style cribs are much in demand so, unless voluntary action is taken across the board, manufacturers who act in good faith could be placed at a marketing disadvantage by those who are less co-operative.

I might also mention that departmental officials have reviewed crib regulations in other countries and have found that finials and posts are only dealt with in a Swedish standard. Authorities in the U.S. are also interested in this subject and the product safety branch has been working with them in their studies.

Since the introduction of regulations on cribs in 1973, all deaths, with the exception of the one referred to, have been associated—and the hon. member should take note of this—with the use of inadequately mentioned cribs manufactured before regulations came into force.

In November of last year, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs launched a major information campaign to alert consumers and retailers of used furniture to the possible hazards in the use of second-hand cribs. The department has also enlisted co-operation from the hotel and motel industry in checking the condition of their cribs to see that they are adequately maintained to ensure protection for young children.

#### GRAIN—COMPENSATION TO FARMERS FOR EMBARGO ON SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West):** Mr. Speaker, my question tonight arises out of questions that I posed to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) on March 10 in which I asked him once again about the long awaited payment to farmers in Canada on the grain embargo imposed by our government and for which there was a commitment to reimburse farmers for any losses they may have incurred by virtue of the imposition of that grain embargo.

I am pleased to see that the response tonight will be given by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Bockstael) who, I should point out to those watching tonight on television, is from western Canada, the city of Winnipeg, and who has the distinction—as far as I can make out, and I have been giving this a lot of thought—of being one of the few Liberals in western Canada who has not been appointed to the

#### Adjournment Debate

board of directors of Air Canada. Nevertheless, he will, as a western Canadian, understand the very serious concern there is across this country, in the west in particular, with respect to the untoward, unprecedented delay on the part of this government after a commitment was made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in March of 1980 that the compensation would be paid.

I just want to review for you, Mr. Speaker, some of the background of this matter to show precisely that there is a long history on the part of this government of broken promises concerning payment to farmers, particularly in western Canada. Last summer the Minister of Agriculture announced that a statement would be made by August 1 with respect to the amount and time of payment of the compensation. He subsequently gave the matter some further thought and later was reported to have announced that the statement on payments would be made in November of 1980. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin) during the course of that summer promised the payments to the farmers for November, 1980. Senator Argue, the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, said in October of 1980 they would likely be made early in January, 1981. We go on then to a debate that took place in this House on December 9, 1980, and at page 5549 the Minister of Agriculture is reported to have said the following:

The final report has yet to be submitted, and I hope this will take place within a few days.

It has been a few months since he made that statement, yet we have received no indication as to when Canadian farmers might expect the payment or, indeed, any statement on the part of the government as to the basis upon which the computation will be made.

● (2225)

On February 23, 1981, as reported at page 7550 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said:

I understand that officials of the various departments involved, in co-operation with the farm groups, are establishing those damages and will be finished their work very soon.

On March 2, 1981, as reported at page 7771 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Agriculture said:

—the recommendation was made to the government this January. It is being considered by the departmental committees at the present time and I hope it will soon come forward to the government.

On March 10, the information we have is that departmental officials had told the Minister of Agriculture that the matter at that time was—and I was so informed in my office—before cabinet. What had happened was that the proposal had never been on the cabinet table prior to that time because the Privy Council office felt that there were details which had to be attended to before cabinet consideration, or there was a possibility that it would have to be considered twice by cabinet. Therefore, it went to the departmental committees for minor alterations.

Finally, on March 10, in response to questions by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) and myself, the Minister of