

horrid. Very often it has as its objective the exploitation of the public. He had with him samples of advertisements to show us what was being done on the other side of the border. The misrepresentations they make give false hopes to people suffering with afflictions of that kind.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Why should we not say that? Why should we not say that advertising of treatment that is prohibited is advertising that amounts to a fraud and/or the exploitation of the public.

Mr. CURRAN: How would you prove that?

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: It would not be difficult at all.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: The Frosst people had no objection to make the other day, and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association's representative had no objection.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out for the benefit of those who were not at previous meetings that those most interested in making representations in objecting to this clause appeared before us. I would refer to the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association, the Canadian Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the President of the Canadian Association of Consumers, and the Manager of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. If any objections were to be raised to that word "treatment" or to the words in this clause, you would expect that they would have been made by those representatives I have just named. They were most interested in having this clarified to the greatest degree possible.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I came up here intending to pass a compliment as to what this committee has done. I was sorry that I had not been able to be here. Senators Hayden and Farris and myself have had our heads down in the Criminal Code Bill, and it has been a big and important job. I was concerned, as I said in the house, with regard to vitamin E because I had some personal experience in connection with it. There was a case of heart attack in my own family, and two people independent entirely told me that their doctors had told them to use vitamin E but not tell anybody that a medical person had advised it. That was an illustration of the row in the medical profession over vitamin E. Well, vitamin E was used in my house and I saw a marked and an immediate response to it, and the individual I have in mind, as a result of it, has been working for the last year. He is coming over here at Christmas to take a holiday that he could not take last year. I find here the treatment of heart disease, and this pointed directly at vitamin E.

The CHAIRMAN: Pardon me for interrupting, but for your benefit you may not know that Dr. Shute, who is the sponsor of this treatment, was here himself last Thursday and discussed the question fully with the committee and with the members of the department.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: And Dr. Shute wrote me a letter which I intend now to lay before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: My information is that a satisfactory conclusion was arrived at at the last meeting, that the sponsoring of vitamin E as a treatment would not be interfered with in any way.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Do you mean by that that Dr. Shute's method of sponsoring this treatment would not be interfered with?

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I may be using the wrong words. Dr. Shute is recommending vitamin E as treatment for a certain disease, and he is a medical man and has a perfect right to do that. My understanding is that nothing in this Act may prevent a doctor from advocating the use of a certain drug for the treatment of a disease.