

tion of the government was to bring in legislation which would provide immediately, and under pressing circumstances, \$6,000 to producers who might require it. Perhaps that saved the government the embarrassment of having to provide some other funds to tide the producer over the difficult situation. In the absence of any other idea, they hit upon the cash advance legislation, but rather than make it functional they simply doubled the amount of the advance. As a result, they ran into a snag. However, the doubled amount which was made available was not recoverable in one year, which simply meant that in the subsequent years the amount of income available to producers was reduced by the amount that had to be recovered. That compounded the problem. Now, after several years of toying with the idea, the government finds itself in the position of having to recover the funds which were made available to the producers.

I do not find much objection to the principle of the legislation. After all, it was our party that introduced it. I can well recall the days when it was said that the Wheat Board would have to resign because they would not be able to recover these sums. This is an old story which is well remembered by many producers. I was very concerned about the reports that people had made submissions to the task force, which accepted the idea to some extent, that eventually the practice of cash advances should be eliminated. I would hate to see the day when this might happen simply to satisfy a few bureaucrats who think that farmers are toying with this money. This is not the case, and I think the minister would be the first to agree with me, because whenever these loans are taken out they are needed. This money has served the rural agricultural communities of western Canada very well over the years.

I am glad the minister has introduced the amendments and thereby dispelled to some extent the fears that were building up in western Canada that this legislation would be thrown overboard, as has happened with many other useful pieces of legislation. I commend the minister for acting on the advice that he has received, and also for listening to the pleas of the farmers that this legislation be continued. Also, I agree that the section of this bill which deals with unharvested grain is a useful provision to have on our statute books, because every time such a situation arises as a result of weather conditions over which there is no control we know that the government is prepared to act, rather than have these people come cap in hand to ask for some assistance.

As we know, legislation is slow in being passed at times. In the meantime, there is a great deal of anxiety and concern among the people involved. They do not know what the government will do. They are at the mercy of governments. Having this type of legislation on the books simply means that the people of Canada are prepared to assist in any emergency situation which may develop in any part of Canada. In this case, the legislation deals with the agricultural situation in western Canada.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

### *Food and Drugs Act*

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton)—Post Office—Alleged difficulties resulting from new mail routings; the hon. member for Lotbinière (M. Fortin)—Regional Economic Expansion—Quebec—Application for interest-free loans from federal government.

It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, notices of motions.

• (5:00 p.m.)

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

### THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

#### AMENDMENT TO EXTEND CONSUMER PROTECTION AGAINST HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS AND FRAUDULENT ADVERTISING

**Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce)** moved that Bill C-39, to amend the Food and Drugs Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill was first put on the order paper in 1966 following the hearings of the Joint Committee on Consumer Affairs which was chaired by the hon. Senator Croll and the present Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford). During the hearings of that committee we found that our consumer protection legislation in Canada was very inadequate, and in order to do something at that time I put forward several measures, one of which was this bill.

This bill proposes certain amendments to the Food and Drugs Act, to extend the coverage of that act to do two things. The first is to protect the consuming public from products which are hazardous and might cause some harm, and the second is to protect them from misleading advertising. As I say, the bill has been on the order paper through several sessions since 1966, and as I have spoken on it previously I will not take up too much time today.

Since I first introduced the bill there has been considerable improvement in our consumer protection legislation. To begin with, following publication of the report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Consumer Affairs, a Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs was established to promote legislation for consumer protection, and generally to serve the interests of the consumer.

Following the establishment of that department, several items of legislation have been passed, and some of