

Members of the farm community in the United States and in Europe have had the comfort of knowing that what they produced was going to bring back at least the cost of production. The farmers in Canada, in all provinces, have not had that comfort. The comfort which has been extended to them, which was that we will pay for their transition in getting out of farming, has been of much less comfort than could have been expected.

Therefore, I suggest that the Speech from the Throne, contained a lot of nice words, a lot of words which should make us think we are going in the right direction, but those words are a mask which covers the face of a Government which does not yet recognize that all the people are its responsibility, that the farmers who are suffering now, the underprivileged, should also be part of it. The attempt to show a more caring face is not really coming through. The old mask of the Party for the privileged is showing more often than it should.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) for his excellent speech. I have had the pleasure of working on the Committee on Agriculture with the Hon. Member and he is obviously very knowledgeable about these topics. I just wanted to make a brief comment and ask the Hon. Member to respond. It has to do with the U.S. Farm Bill.

Together with other Hon. Members of the House I had the opportunity to go to Washington earlier this year in order to have a three-day briefing on the U.S. Farm Bill. Quite apart from the fact that it is a disastrous piece of legislation in terms of what it will do to Canadian agriculture, \$70 billion U.S. in subsidies, which is \$100 billion Canadian, is aimed directly at competing against our agricultural commodities. When we came out of our briefings in Washington we had meetings with our Embassy people. I asked our Embassy people the following questions. What kind of lobby did we put together to ensure that this type of legislation would not pass? What attempts did we make in order to have the legislation amended which, in turn, would reduce the serious effects that it would cause Canadian agriculture? More specifically, I asked whom we had hired to lobby on our behalf.

● (1550)

As all Hon. Members know, we hired Mr. Deaver to lobby on acid rain, despite the fact that he was apparently a controversial individual. However, he did an effective lobbying job, or at least he was seen as being effective. I was told that we did not hire anyone to perform a lobbying function and that, in fact, whatever lobbying was done was done by a few staff members at our Washington Embassy. That was the response to what I consider to be one of the most offensive pieces of legislation to Canadian agriculture passed by any country on the face of the globe. We did not even retaliate or attempt to influence the legislation other than by having one or two people at our Embassy make a few phone calls, or whatever else they did.

### *The Address—Mr. Hovdebo*

Will the Hon. Member respond to my comments? As far as I can see, this issue is an important and fundamental one. Perhaps if we had made a better effort we could have had some impact with respect to lessening the bad side-effects of the legislation.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his question and for his comment. I think that he has answered his own question in that we know what was done and what was not done in order to have some effect on the legislation.

The Hon. Member pointed out one of the factors which not only we in Canada but those in the world community dependent on trade need to consider. I refer to the ideology which allowed, suggested, or even pushed the U.S. Congress to pass such legislation even when it knew it would have some effect on the economies of the world, not only the Canadian economy but the economies of many other countries. I refer to countries such as Zambia, for instance, which was affected by the Farm Bill. Zambia can no longer sell the peanuts which it produces. Peanuts are also being dumped on the world market at lower prices. The legislation affects the Third World as well as countries such as Canada.

It is absolutely necessary to change the ideology of trade. It is no longer any good to do what must be done at the expense of whoever happens to be in the road. That is the philosophy on which the Farm Bill was constructed. Unfortunately, such a move affects not only us Canadians but most primary producers in the world.

**Mr. Brightwell:** Mr. Speaker, I always listen closely to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo). I noted a variety of subjects that he discussed today. I took particular note of his statement with regard to agriculture. He said that French farmers knew, when they planted their crops, what they would receive. He said the same with respect to American farmers. I suggest to the Hon. Member that perhaps in Canada farmers know what they will receive when they plant their crops. We have agriculture stabilization legislation which allows for a payment of some 90 per cent of the five-year average price for crops. Thus, I believe Canadian farmers know what they will receive for their crops.

I also wish to bring up another point. I believe the Hon. Member is sitting too close to members of the Official Opposition. He is becoming affected by their rhetoric, especially that of the Hon. Member for Montréal—Saint-Marie (Mr. Malépart) and the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) who both take off on flights of fancy every once in a while.

The Hon. Member said that we bailed out the banks. Of course we did not bail out the banks; we bailed out the investors. The Hon. Member said that pornography legislation is of great concern. There was a bit of a play on words in his remarks. He said that the pornography legislation was a bust.

The Hon. Member discussed the area of the family allowance. He said that we have not allowed the family allowance to