

## Canagrex

I might add, again parenthetically, Madam Speaker, that the success has also come about because of the will that is demonstrated by the Ministry to make those sales and to show leadership and a desire to knock on doors in the international markets. It is not going to be a case of developing a new agency, putting a name on it in neon lights and pretending for a moment that that in and of itself will guarantee some success. The Government has proven it can take that approach within available resources. I would emphasize that all the advances I have mentioned have been achieved within a framework of fiscal restraint.

The Government has applied that same initiative in the efforts to reduce trade restrictions and unreasonable export subsidies in the international market-place.

Through bilateral negotiations with the United States, our Government is attempting to remove trade barriers which restrict access to our largest export market. Agriculture is well represented in these negotiations through the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise), who is a member of the federal Cabinet special subcommittee overseeing the talks; farm industry representatives on the International Trade Advisory Committee, the main link between negotiators and the private sector; and a sectoral advisory group on international trade devoted exclusively to agriculture, food and beverages. This body, which comprises some 30 members drawn from all branches of the agriculture sector, is the largest of all the special advisory committees dealing with those trade negotiations. The Government of Canada is actively pursuing the liberalization of agricultural trade at the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations.

I want for a moment to add one other aspect about freer trade and say that I am one who believes—and I know there are others who share this view—that had Canagrex been established in a large office tower staffed with people as an institution that may not have been the symbol the opposition Members wanted for greater trade, it may well have been the symbol that would have restricted trade *vis-à-vis* the United States, which is our largest market. That would have been held as one of the symbols that could have done us the greatest damage in the long run.

The Government of Canada is actively pursuing the liberalization of those trade negotiations, as Members will know from the Uruguay initiative. I commend the Government for its efforts to end the international trade war which is threatening the livelihood of our grain farmers. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) pointed out in his address to the House on October 3, our farmers are being penalized through no fault of their own. They are being hurt and they have done nothing wrong.

As part of its deep commitment to agriculture, the Government is taking appropriate and effective action to end the injustices prevailing in global markets.

• (1710)

I hear the word “time”, Madam Speaker, and I see my time has expired. Thank you very much for the opportunity to improve the mood and optimism of the Hon. Member for Davenport, the Hon. Member for Algoma, and the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre concerning farmers and their ability to run their farms without a large government bureaucracy.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Questions and comments.

**Mr. Foster:** Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member seemed to be going off sort of half-cocked, not really knowing much about the Canagrex organization and the fact that it was operating for several months. It was able to do a great deal while it was allowed to operate. The Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) and the Hon. Member for Missis-sauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) do not seem to think producers of smaller volume agricultural commodities should have the same kind of assistance that we see offered to producers of major commodities through organizations like the Canadian Wheat Board or the Canadian Dairy Commission. I would be interested in knowing why the Hon. Member is opposed to these national organizations. I am really hard put to understand why producers of these smaller volume commodities should not have the same kind of assistance in marketing. I just do not follow the logic. I am sure the Hon. Member is not suggesting we should get rid of the Canadian Dairy Commission or the Canadian Wheat Board.

Canagrex, of course, would operate as a small agency to assist the smaller volume producer. I would be interested in knowing why he feels the producer of those commodities should not have the same kind of assistance from a small and specialized unit like Canagrex as it was established and operating a couple of years ago.

**Mr. Malone:** Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member thought I went off half-cocked. I want him to know that I am fully cocked. The Hon. Member tries to make out these sales he talks about as being rather significant and large. I submit that any objective analysis will show they are quite insignificant and small. Moreover, there is virtually no data or logical reason to believe that the sales made by Canagrex with its \$6 million budget, buildings and people, would not have been made anyway. Those sales would have been made regardless. That is on the record and easily understandable. Another fact is that the information Canagrex obtained, it obtained from the Department of Agriculture.

What the Hon. Member is talking about is \$6 million now, and 10 years from now it would be an amount that would make \$6 million look pretty small. This is just another example of the fact that we are in different political Parties and I, for one, am glad we are. He is simply saying that as a Liberal he would build more buildings, create more bureaucracy, hold up a symbol, and believe it will do some good.