

middle of this debate between the two ministers. I ask the parliamentary secretary to clarify the positions of these two ministers. I further ask whether the government has given consideration to setting up a committee to look into a national food policy.

In my opinion there are two things that must be done in this House. As I mentioned before, the first is to set a parliamentary committee. The second is to make major changes in the Department of Agriculture. I call upon the government to set up a department of agriculture and food. It would give greater power to the Department of Agriculture and would complement what would be left of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The department would then have greater power in all areas of government.

● (1820)

It is becoming abundantly clear that unless policy changes are made the food industry will find itself unable to cope with demands in both the domestic and export markets in the future. We are facing a mini-crisis in the area of food policy, and the government must make fundamental changes. The first should be to create a ministry of agriculture and food and then to send a parliamentary committee, properly staffed, across the country to sound out the feelings of Canadians in all walks of life as to what they would like to see in a national food policy. At present we have absolutely no co-ordinated approach to agriculture and food.

We must remember that agriculture is more than just the farm gate. It comprises wholesalers, retailers, distributors, and tariff policies, and all these areas at the present time are segmented. I urge the government to look seriously into this idea of sending out a parliamentary committee, to consider seriously making the major changes to which I have referred, and to examine carefully the advantages of setting up a department of food and agriculture.

**Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his concern about a national food policy and for the representations he has made in this regard. I would point out that the representations he has made in the course of this adjournment debate are somewhat extended as compared with those he made on May 31. At that time he was talking about a joint food policy council. He now talks about a committee which would travel about the country, and suggests certain changes affecting the Department of Agriculture.

The response of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on June 23 might be repeated in this regard: these are serious representations and they will be well considered.

As the hon. member himself said, the question he posed has to a certain extent been overtaken by events in the past two weeks. The government has already announced a food strategy which provides a set of guidelines or principles to be followed in order to assure all Canadians of adequate supplies of safe and nutritious food at prices which are reasonable to both producers and consumers.

### *Employment and Immigration*

The strategy provides an umbrella under which policies and initiatives will fit. As the strategy makes clear, consultations will be taking place on specific prospects as we flesh out each part of them. This is why the Prime Minister said earlier that he considers the question to be a representation and why it is a subject for serious consideration.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been withdrawn.

Motion withdrawn.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At 6.25 p.m. the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION REORGANIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-27, to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, and motions nos. 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18.

**Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, when I left off this afternoon we were discussing the fiddling around by the government with the extended benefit period under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Also grouped within the set of motions to be debated was one in which the government foresaw using the unemployment insurance fund for job creation purposes. When the committee was hearing evidence on Bill C-27, witnesses representing employers and employees came before the committee. It is not very often that such groups agree on things, but in this particular instance all employee and employer groups which appeared before the committee did agree on one thing. The work sharing proposals put forward by the government were completely opposed by all groups representing employers and employees.