

Supply—External Affairs

position that until we get a statement of government policy the government ought not to be allowed to proceed as provided for in the item. The Minister should not argue now that we are not at liberty to call attention to what we believe to be inadequacies in government policy. That is surely an unwise course of action. We could suggest that there should be no reimbursement until the government declares its position.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Is that what you propose?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I simply say we could take that position. By referring to this possibility I reveal the weakness of my hon. friend's procedural argument. This is what the brief says in addition to what I have already quoted, and I invite hon. gentlemen to consider if it is not on all fours with the item now before the committee:

Many milk producers are of the opinion that our surplus food should be used for economic aid to underdeveloped countries in the Far East. Large numbers of people in this world are starving in the midst of plenty.

The brief then refers us to an article from the *Financial Post* on this subject. We on this side point out that if this is the situation, as undoubtedly it is, the government under this item should give consideration to the announcement of a policy that would provide assistance to the milk producers.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Some hon. gentlemen shout "order".

Mr. Lennard: I did not say "order"; I said you were stupid.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): What hon. gentlemen are now asserting is that we are precluded from urging the government to take a step that does involve reimbursement to international organizations so as to give relief to the milk producers of Canada, who during the past few days have made representations to the government.

Mr. Lennard: How stupid can you be?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, further to the point made by the hon. member for Essex East may I say I did not mind his reference to me being his parliamentary assistant, as long as I am not identified with the Martin bureau of statistics.

There is a question involved here which, it seems to me, needs to be seen in the light of the reputed statement, at least, of the Minister of Agriculture that you could not even give this skim milk away. I am not going to say that he said that as a matter of truth because I did not hear him say it and

I have not been able to find it, but I have been told by some milk producers that he did make that statement. Obviously this item is evidence which indicates that it can be given away. As a consequence I would ask the Minister of Finance the names of those particular international relief agencies. What quantities did they receive, and to what countries in the world did they distribute this particular milk? If he has the information I should like to have it.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Yes, Mr. Chairman. The donations of dry skimmed milk already made or expected to be made by the 31st day of this month are as follows: UNICEF, 9,018,166 pounds; Canadian Lutheran world relief, 2,361,750 pounds; Unitarian service committee of Canada, 224,600 pounds; CARE, 1,512,650 pounds; the Canadian council of churches, 127,600 pounds. It is expected that a further requirement will be sought by UNICEF of 350,000 pounds. This makes a total of 13,594,766 pounds.

Mr. Benidickson: What is the practice of the agricultural stabilization board in the matter of delivery? For instance, what freight charges are accounted for in this vote? What is the practice in so far as shipping and delivery costs are concerned? Where are these things delivered?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The practice in Canada has been to deliver at seaboard; that is to say, the recipient takes delivery at seaboard. This is not a uniform international practice, but it is the practice which Canada has followed.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Minister of Agriculture is in the house tonight, and one would not expect the Minister of Finance, though his knowledge of these matters is obviously great, to be able to answer all questions dealing with agriculture. Having in mind the complaints which the minister used to make when he was on this side of the house about the minister of finance speaking on behalf of the whole government, would this not be a good opportunity for the Minister of Finance to give his colleagues, those ministers who are responsible for these particular matters, particularly when they are in the house, the opportunity to comment on matters of concern to them. The Minister of Agriculture attempted to rise a few moments ago—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, he did not.

Mr. Martin (Essex East):—to answer the question I put to him and which the Minister of Finance wished to divert for some other occasion. He wanted to leave this