

words a lot. We have to be realistic. It pointed the finger and said that we should not do that. It concerns me that every time somebody points a finger at us we say: "Okay, we will change".

• (1200 )

I am getting the impression that we are suckers; we are the good guys. We are the guys that are doing what other countries say should be done. We could debate that at another time, but then we do it, and they say thank you very much but they do not make any changes themselves. I think that is very evident.

I read the other day that the 1990 U.S. farm bill is virtually not making any changes as far as assistance to agriculture in the United States compared to the 1985 bill, but the United States is pointing its finger at Canada and saying that we cannot do this and we cannot do that. We had a finger pointed at us—so we literally lay down and died—then said, "Okay, if you don't want us to do it, we won't do it." It is going to be done off the backs of the farmers to the extent of \$25 million or \$27 million a year.

This is a program that does not stimulate production. This is a program that has been used for orderly marketing and will be used for orderly marketing by a few people, I will admit, but not by nearly as many and that is the concern.

The government agreed back in April at the GATT rounds to freeze the level of agriculture support. Here we are, being nice guys again to the rest of the world, saying, "Well, we won't freeze. We will reduce more whether you fellows do or not".

The other question I may have already answered: Is this program unlike that of any of those of our neighbours to the south? No, it is not. They have their loan programs and we do not get any impression that they are reducing them. It upsets me when we say that we are going to reduce ours. If they will reciprocate and reduce some of theirs, then that is a different game. We are in a different situation.

Where is our spine? Are we just going to lay down and die on this, or are we going to say to some of the finger-pointers, "No, this is something that we want to do for agriculture in Canada. This is something that we

### *Government Orders*

feel is a good return on tax dollars, and this is something we are going to fight for". Farmers feel that they have given a fair bit. Farmers are not opposed to giving their share toward attacking the deficit. They have been told they are going to do it on the excise tax. They have been told they are going to do it on dairy support programs.

Pork producers know that through actions that have taken place about which the government is not happy, and I hope that it can be successful in fighting it, there are countervails on pork, ice cream and yogurt. We pleaded for exemptions to the United States trade bill before we signed the deal last winter, but we did not get them. Now we re paying the price.

I request of the ministry that we debate these items back and forth with our neighbours to the south. I implore the minister to get as good a list of the support programs that they have south of the border as they appear to have of ours so that we can go back and argue some of these points.

Another question arises: Is the government consulting or even listening to the advice of the agriculture sector that is involved in this decision? I know the government is getting the information. I do not know whether it is reading it. I do not know whether it is listening to it if it hears it.

Farmers have recently and more often asked me if the government has lost the word "consultation" from its dictionary. I say that I certainly have that impression. The government does not seem to want to talk. It does not seem to want to listen.

I will quote from a letter to the Minister of Agriculture of September 20, from the Ontario Corn Producers:

The Ontario Corn Producers Association respectfully requests that this bill to amend the Advance Payments for Crops Act (APCA) not be passed in its present form.

We request that the current APCA programs be continued, with the interest-free provision, at least for the 1989-90 crop year.

During the coming year, OCPA and other farm organizations could consult with the federal government to develop acceptable alternatives to the current APCA programs.

Failure to enter any agreements for 1989-90 would result in financial difficulties for the many producers who have prepared cash-flow statements for 1989-90 and have received credit for the coming crop year based on the assumed continued existence of the APCA Program.