

Agricultural Products Board

give members of this house, including members of the minister's own party, an opportunity to show that they are behind his placing in the proper legislation at the proper time a floor price which will give this guarantee to the farmers.

In the public accounts committee the other day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) stated that it was the duty of the government to maintain a suitable market for government bonds. Several years ago in this house, when I asked that there should be a floor of the par value under government bonds, that they should always be negotiable at par, Right Hon. Mr. Ilsley said that he did not believe it would be right to put that provision in the legislation, but no government would allow government bonds to fluctuate unduly. I say that if no government will allow government bonds to fluctuate unduly, then no government should allow the prices of agricultural products, the basic food of our country, to fluctuate unduly. It is just as great a responsibility to see that people are able to eat and that food is produced for them to eat as it is for them to maintain a stable market for government bonds, and in my opinion it is a great deal more important. All we are asking the government to do in this amendment is maintain stable prices for agricultural products so that our farmers will go ahead and produce as they can produce and as they have produced in the past. In 1944 we produced over 600 million pounds of pork products.

Mr. Gardiner: On a question of order, I understood my friend was starting off to speak on a point of order in reply to what I had said before, but if he is going to make a speech, which in my opinion is out of order, then I think we should have a ruling on the question of whether we are in order in discussing another measure on this measure. This bill is before the house, not the other act, and I do not assume that when a measure of this kind is before the house, or any measure is before the house, we have the right to turn aside and discuss some other bill or act which is not related at all to the one under discussion.

Mr. Wright: I am not discussing another act. I am discussing this bill, the purpose of which is to set up an agricultural products board. Surely one of the functions of the board will be to maintain orderly marketing in this country. Otherwise there is no object in setting it up. I am talking about orderly marketing of agricultural products, and I think that is very definitely within the scope of this particular bill. Has the minister anything to say to that?

Mr. Gardiner: I am waiting for Mr. Speaker to give his ruling. I do not think I need to say anything more.

Mr. Knowles: Are you ruling on the discussion or on the amendment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I have read the amendment. It is submitted no doubt under the provisions of paragraph 657 of *Beauchesne*, third edition, which reads as follows:

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges.

It seems to me that similar amendments moved in the last few years were allowed to stand. I have not had an opportunity of looking it up yet, but in view of that I would hesitate to rule the amendment out of order at this time without at least looking up the amendment moved previously.

Mr. Knowles: May I confirm your memory, Mr. Speaker, by telling you that on March 27, 1950, a similar amendment was moved by the same member, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue), and it is to be found at page 1157 of *Hansard* for that year. You will find that on the next day, March 28, 1950, after considerable debate the amendment was voted on. It is similar to other amendments of a similar character, the details of which I have, but I will not take the time of the house to give them. That one is the best precedent because the amendment was in words very similar to the amendment which is now before you.

Mr. Gardiner: May I ask whether that was not an amendment to the Agricultural Prices Support Act?

Mr. Knowles: Correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gardiner: That is the other bill, of course.

Mr. Knowles: The amendment was not to the bill itself but to the motion for second reading of a bill amending the Agricultural Prices Support Act.

Mr. Gardiner: That would be quite in order—

Mr. Knowles: Just a minute. In both cases the amendments suggest that the bill before the house be not now read a second time but in the words of citation 657 which you, Mr. Speaker, read a moment ago, "a resolution