

Supply

assistance rather than the government coming up front and saying what the program is and what assistance is going to be made available. The government is simply not doing well enough.

Mr. Len Gustafson (Souris—Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the hon. member for Algoma gets so exercised when he hears the work the Prime Minister has been doing and carrying on at the international level. Especially when we hear day after day from a party across the way that is opposed to free trade. It wants a protectionist approach. Here we are with a country that exports 80 per cent of its product in terms of wheat, durums and grain and that party has a mishmash of policy that would make your head spin.

I wonder what would happen if that party were to try to implement the kinds of policies where it says on the one hand it will do this and on the other hand do that. There is not a clear direction of where that party is going. Then it trivializes the international situation of the trade war.

Nobody said that one man could solve this all alone. However, certainly one man can give the right direction as we saw just last week with the Prime Minister's visit to Washington and his dealing with the trade situation and the international trade war going on.

As far as I can see and watching day after day in this House, whether it is the leader of the NDP or the leader of the Liberal Party, there is no direction. There would be very little if any international presence in which the existing situation in Canada would be put forward.

It is interesting that this member from Algoma would stand in the House and trivialize the immensity of not only an international recession but also an international trade war that is going on. Anybody who is not aware of that is not aware of what is going on.

Any government that does not deal with that in trade, just to give an example, the U.S. is now our fourth largest trading partner in wheat. Close that border on livestock. Incidentally, livestock has hit the highest price in terms of 97 cents a pound for live weight cattle shipped with much of it going into the United States. I do not know how the opposition would deal with a situation

like that. We would have the old Trudeau era again: Sell your own wheat, do your own thing.

• (1140)

In commenting on what has been, the hon. member knows we had 20 per cent interest rates in 1985. Under this Prime Minister, we have the lowest interest rates in 31 years. Certainly there are international problems and they are immense but with the mishmash of ideas that on the one hand this and on the other hand that which come from the leadership of the Liberal Party, I would fear as a farmer to live under that direction.

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. parliamentary secretary had really been interested in bringing information to the House today, he would have told us exactly what the Prime Minister did in Washington last week. We saw him walking around with the new President.

This House passed a unanimous resolution on February 12, 1992. It directed the Prime Minister to meet with the President and to secure his support for our position on a strengthened and clarified article XI. We want to know, as do the dairy farmers, the poultry industry and the supply management groups of Canada whether he did that. Did he do anything? Did he really accomplish anything in Washington or was he just looking for a photo opportunity?

People are interested in the results. Why did the Prime Minister not go there and get a commitment from President Clinton? Why did he not get a commitment if he has all this international power and influence? Nobody is trivializing the trade war. The trade war has been a disaster.

The parliamentary secretary is telling us that the Prime Minister has great influence, that he is a senior member of the G-7. If he is this member and has all this influence, why is he not able to sit down with President Clinton and get a commitment to support us with our supply management system? Clearly his Minister of Agriculture is reported to have supported supply management systems in the United States. If that is true, then there should be no problem convincing the President that it is a good system for not only Canada, but also for the United States.

If we look at the Washington news press releases, Mr. Espy, the secretary of agriculture, has voted for supply management bills in the past. Therefore groups like the