

of one of the committees objects for any reason to a proposal the proposal will be dropped.

After the committees prepare their reports a miscellaneous statute law amendment bill is prepared. This bill contains only the proposals which are unanimously approved by both committees. Historically, the bills have been passed quickly, given the usual understanding that they will receive all three readings in each House without debate.

The discussion of these proposals is usually completely uncontroversial and a routine process. This is partially due to the fact that there are strict criteria for the types of proposals that the committee will consider. For example, the proposal must not be controversial, involve the spending of public funds, prejudicially affect the rights of persons, create a new offence or subject a new class of persons to an existing offence.

Essentially, the proposals under the Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Act represent an attempt at legislative housekeeping. Members from all parties are in agreement with the process.

Last February when the former justice minister stood in this House to table a proposal, the member for York Centre, a member of the Official Opposition, commented on the useful nature of the process. Because I notice he is listening very intently I will quote him accurately from page 8349 of *Hansard* of February 15 where he is reported to have said:

I consider it a very useful device for achieving necessary changes in the laws of Canada of a non-controversial nature and also reflecting legal advice and second thoughts about certain clauses of the legislation. I have always regretted that the miscellaneous amending process is not used more openly and more generously than it is.

After that hon. member spoke, the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway representing the New Democratic Party stood up to agree that his party was also in favour of the proposed process. He indicated that it could be extended and used successfully to eliminate sexist language from legislation.

This year the justice committee is considering some 75 different acts that have been proposed. Up for repeal, for example, is the Trade Marks Act, overseen by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Paragraphs 45(4)(A) to (C) of this act were excluded from the

Private Members' Business

Revised Statutes of Canada, 1985 because they deal with the renewal of the registration of trade marks that were registered under various predecessor acts of the Trade Marks Act. These paragraphs require that registration of a trade mark under the predecessor acts be renewed under the Trade Marks Act not later than July 1, 1979.

Once renewed under the Trade Marks Act, the registration of a trade mark is subject to renewal within a period of 15 years after the last renewal. As the renewal of the registration of trade marks is now governed entirely by the Trade Marks Act, there is no need to retain these transitional provisions, which are now spent.

Another statute up for repeal under the current proposals is the Fruit, Vegetables and Honey Act. This act meets all the criteria for consideration under the Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Program. It is not controversial. It does not involve the spending of public funds. It does not prejudicially affect the rights of persons. It does not create a new offence.

In fact, the Fruit, Vegetables and Honey Act does not do anything anymore. It has been replaced by the regulations made under the Canada Agricultural Products Act. Therefore it is not necessary to pass these amendments.

Mrs. Edna Anderson (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, the bill we are debating today unnecessarily proposes to legislate the declaration of country of origin for fresh fruit and vegetables. This requirement already exists in the Canada Agricultural Products Act.

As members of the House may know, Canadian fruit and vegetable producers are protected in other ways.

During the drafting of the free trade agreement, this government negotiated special measures to help Canadian fruit and vegetable producers compete. The free trade agreement provides for the elimination of all tariffs between Canada and the United States by 1998. In view of the sensitivity of the horticultural industry to import competition, tariffs on fresh fruit and vegetables are being eliminated in 10 equal stages.

A special safeguard provision was negotiated at Canada's request to protect fresh fruit and vegetable producers from abnormally depressed prices. Article 702 of the free trade agreement allows both Canada and the United States to impose temporary or snap-back duties