

*Supply*

supercilious answers when they see their way of life disappearing in front of their eyes. That is what the resolution is about. It is not simply saying business as usual or that we should tinker with the system. We are talking about an economy that is being severed from its ties.

The Member from Metro Toronto rose to his feet to say that he felt a common cause with farmers. It was a genuine statement, and I agree with it. However, if he says that, then he should vote for the resolution which says what farmers want. It is not based upon some esoteric think-tank or upon what officials in the Department of Agriculture said. It is based upon the discussions we have held with farmers over past months who are worried about losing everything they have.

I was part of a task force of our caucus which visited our four western provinces during the parliamentary break. At every single stop farmers refuted exactly what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) had to say today. They said they needed an efficiency payment or a commitment that the initial payment on Canadian Wheat Board grains would be maintained at last year's level. They needed not only to continue their cash flow to allow them to buy their seeds and to make their preparations for planting, but to send a signal to the Americans and the Europeans that we in Canada will not be forced out of business.

We know what is the objective of the U.S. Farm Bill. It is to put us out of business. The Americans are using their incredible volumes of grain to bring down world prices, to subsidize their farmers at \$3 or \$4 per bushel, and to push the producers of Canada, Argentina, and Australia out of business. The only way to convince them and to stop that demonic attempt to put us out of business is to send them the signal that we will not be cowed.

If it means that Canadians will be required to pay more money to support farmers over the next year or two or three years, then we should say so now and tell the Americans and the Europeans that they cannot push us around. That is the kind of signal that is needed.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Champagne) rose and said that he had this matter put on the agenda of the summit. However, what have they done since then? Have they given the Americans that kind of signal?

I refer to a brief which we received when we were in Winnipeg. It was from United Grain Growers. In the polite language which is used in front of parliamentary groups, it reads: "It is disappointing in our view to see a country like Australia deliver its message effectively to the United States when Canada has such strong economic and social ties with our neighbours to the south". During their presentation they said that they were disappointed with the Minister of State for Canadian Wheat Board (Mr. Mayer) in terms of the "dance of the seven veils" which he does at those meetings. It is no longer a time for cute diplomacy. It is no time to repeat the briefs written by the people in the striped pants from the Department of External Affairs. It is time for tough language with the

Americans. It is time for tough language which says that they will not put us out of business, and that we will keep our farmers on the land producing effectively until there is a change. The Americans have not heard that kind of language from the Government, and that is what we need.

They will not stop. They have every intention of keeping the U.S. Farm Bill and of ratcheting down the prices 15 per cent to 20 per cent this year, next year, and the year after, until someone says "halt". That is partly the reason for the resolution. That is partly why the Government needs to give a signal now, not several months from now.

We also believe that there is an opportunity for both sides of the House to give a clear message that we will do something about farmers affected by credit problems. We tend to disparage these people. We talk about marginal farmers who will go out of business anyway. What kind of language is that? Who in this House of Commons is so omniscient that he can call someone a marginal farmer?

I was told by the Minister of Agriculture that somehow the only people who have any business participating in this debate are the farmers themselves. It is like saying that only women should be interested in feminist issues or only easterners should discuss problems of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I am a Member of Parliament. I come from western Canada. I am deeply concerned about what I see happening in my region of the country. I will speak out on it, whether or not I am a farmer. What I am saying is that many of those farmers were aggressive farmers in the 1970s. They were good farmers who talked about expanding their operations and building up their machinery. There are young farmers with degrees in agriculture. The future of farming is in the hands of the people who are now in deep arrears to the FCC. Those are the people upon whom we need to build. They are the future of our grain economy. They are the ones who are going down the chute.

We heard the numbers. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) indicated that 30 per cent of FCC credit holders have been in arrears for over two years. In fact they are legally bankrupt.

What has the Government done? Hon. Members across the way have been beating their chests in pride about what they have done. They have given \$15 million to the FCC in two years, \$10 million of which was to help write down some debts; \$10 million against an outstanding debt pool of over \$23 billion. This is what the Government is doing to deal with the credit crunch facing the farm economy. It is not fair to the farmers. It is not fair to the country as a whole. The Hon. Member from Metro Toronto was right. The rest of us depend in large part upon the grain economy and the farm economy.

• (1800)

The jobs of the people in the food processing industry and the many workers in transportation depend upon land producers. So why are we letting the land go fallow? Why are we