

Supply

If they were travelling around the world today, they would discover that because of the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement, the rest of the world looks favourably on Canada as a place to invest, as a place for the future, because of our improved market access to the United States of America.

This may have been mentioned earlier today in this debate, I was not able to hear my hon. colleague, the Minister of State responsible for the Wheat Board, a brilliant minister, but just look at our record in agriculture. We came to the aid of the farmers of Canada when they were caught in the crossfire of the trade war between the United States and the European Community. Largely to offset the effects of that trade war, we paid about \$12 billion in direct and indirect support to grain producers between 1985 and 1989.

That is a record that the hon. gentlemen, no matter how much they caterwaul, how much they complain, how much they niggle, how much they distort, how much they bray, cannot gainsay \$12 billion in direct and indirect support. While the hon. gentleman who preceded me was braying away in this House over the last four years, we were acting. We were acting to put \$12 billion in direct and indirect support to grain producers.

We want to help grain producers further by negotiating the conclusion of a successful Uruguay Round of the multilateral trade negotiations at Geneva and that is what we intend to do. The only way Canadian farmers and farmers interested in exports are going to have assurance for their future is if we can successfully conclude a trade negotiation at Geneva in the Uruguay Round that will set proper international rules for agricultural products and bring them under GATT from the end of 1990 onwards. That is what will give them assurance because our farmers, if left to compete fairly, can compete, outsell, outdo, outgrow and be more efficient than any other group of farmers in the world.

In fact, over the previous four years the Government of Canada, of which I am proud to be a member, has invested \$17 billion in agriculture, double the money spent by our predecessor Liberal government in the previous four-year period. The Liberals are not even in the picture.

We have had to defend farmers against destructive trade practices, and we have defended them. Just keep in mind that the net market receipts for grains and oilseeds dropped from an annual average level of \$2.4 billion between 1981 to 1984, to \$475 million in 1987, and you can see the impact and the need for the unprecedented support that we have given the Canadian farmer.

Now we have to go on and we have to secure international trade reforms. This is the most important negotiation for the nations of the world since the world began—that is not to sound too dramatic—but certainly, since the GATT system came into effect in the late 1940s. Agriculture is going to be the making or the breaking of this trade negotiation. That is why we have tried to take a leading role in the negotiations that have to do with agriculture. That is why we have been members of the Cairns group to try to get an acceptable compromise agreed upon by the nations of the world in agriculture so that agriculture can be covered by world trading rules.

Middle nations like Canada are not one of the world's giant nations. We are middle power. We do not have supervening power. We cannot ignore all the other countries of the world. We are not one of the world's great military giants. We are not one of the world's great economic giants. We are the kind of country that is going to be really hurt if we cannot get a successful resolution of these issues in the MTN negotiations.

The government has put in at Geneva a market access paper that will apply to Canadian agri-food products as well as to other agri-food products. We have put in papers and subsidies and countervail. We are taking a leading role in these negotiations, non-tariff barriers and other barriers to trade that are being discussed at Geneva. We are working on clarifying and strengthening Article 11 which sets out the conditions under which countries may operate supply management systems.

• (1640)

Now, don't let us get anyone confused by the meanderings and the distortions of the honourable Lilliputians opposite, the honourable dwarfs—dwarfs when it comes to policy. How often do we ever hear a suggestion with respect to policy by the honourable dwarfs opposite? Very infrequently.

Now, what is our position with respect to agricultural trade reform? We know that agriculture in Canada is going to profit from increased trade liberalization and that is why we are supporting a clear and fair set of rules