

This resolution begins with "It is expedient". Now, surely, the main point that one is asking on this resolution is whether this is expedient or something else is expedient. It seems to me it would be an abridgment of our traditional rights to restrict the discussion as suggested. In any event, it would be an abridgment of our traditional rights to seek to limit us in the way in which the hon. member says the minister was not limited.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):** May I speak on the point of order? I should like to support the stand taken by the hon. member for Assiniboia and the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate, for this reason. This is one of the major parts of the government's national agricultural program and can be discussed intelligently only if the whole program can be referred to and discussed in toto. I would suggest it would do great harm to the discussion of this bill at the resolution stage, and certainly at the second reading stage, if we limited the discussion to the narrow terms of this part of the national agricultural program.

**The Deputy Chairman:** May I say just one thing. Of course, under standing order 59(2) speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration. The Chair does not make the rules; the Chair tries to interpret them and the Chair tends to be very lenient in so far as that is possible.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** And the Chair is very fair.

**Mr. Argue:** I think we are all in a very generous mood at the moment. While I agree very much with the Chairman, that the rule must be enforced, there is another well-known practice in this house and that is, if there is unanimous agreement, our own procedure is in our own hands. I think, however, on the point of order the minister is correct, that in dealing with such a large part of the government's agricultural policy it is very difficult not to make reference to other parts or, indeed, to make proposals as to additional projects which should be contained in the resolution.

I was pointing out, Mr. Chairman, that I thought there should be provision for national marketing. I want to make it the fifth suggestion. As part of the government's agricultural program a board of livestock commissioners should be established to provide for scientific grading standards to protect farmers' interests in the market. I think that such a board would receive the support of the agricultural community and could do a good deal to ensure that farmers were given fair

#### *Agreements Respecting Marginal Lands*

grades for the products they sell and when given a fair grade get an appropriate price for that grade at that time.

As point six I suggest that if we are to provide for the stabilization of agriculture and for rural development in the world as we know it the government should have the support of this house in all of its efforts to have a workable international food pool established under the United Nations. This is another long term proposal, of course. A working international food pool is essential, not just from the standpoint of the co-ordination of the agricultural industry in exporting nations but it is necessary to the welfare of people in all parts of the world.

The seventh suggestion I have to make is that steps should be taken at an early date to provide that some of our surplus food should be made available by appropriate means to low income groups within our society. At a time when there is widespread unemployment there is naturally a growing demand that the government undertake measures to make surplus Canadian food more readily available to Canadians who have inadequate and low incomes.

At this point, I might say I hope that this government will no longer delay action in making available surplus food from Canada to help starving peoples wherever they may be, and I have special reference to starvation in the Congo at this time.

Point number eight that I have listed here, Mr. Chairman, is an improvement and an extension of the provisions of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act which I think are part and parcel of any kind of a rural redevelopment program. I think the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, which has been on the statute books for many years, is the kind of program that, if developed, will meet loss of income through crop failure much more adequately than the crop insurance scheme that is now on the statute books, a scheme that in the very nature of things will be available for many years to come only to a minority of agricultural producers, that minority being those producers who have few crop failures and therefore can afford to pay the lower rates of insurance.

The need for support for rural income, the need for the development of an agricultural program, is very great. I want to remind the Minister of Agriculture that in his statement about the program he is putting forward there was no reference to the need of assistance to farmers in the development of a system of adequate farm to market roads. The minister may throw up his hands and say: This has no part in a national government policy. I differ. I think it is time we had a national road policy in this country.