

Supply

How can the Hon. Member, when he has not assessed the whole picture, stand and talk in the way he has against a trade agreement that is for the future of Canada, for a growing Canada, for a strong Canada, for a Canada that is already great but will be greater because of this agreement?

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I believe my time is close to expiring. The Hon. Member has asked how I can be against the agreement. Very easily. It is a bad agreement. It is an awful agreement. It is not good, not only for the dairy producers but for agriculture generally. It is certainly not good for the dairy producers.

It is certainly not as bad as it could have been had all of supply management been eliminated. I will recognize that. I will give them a bit of credit. The agreement could have been worse, if that is complimenting the Tories. That is as far as I will go because it is certainly not good for the agriculture sector. The dairy industry was promised that it would be totally protected and was not totally protected. There was a breach of that promise.

The Hon. Member knows that there are three fundamental underpinnings of supply management. One has been damaged. The Prime Minister breached a solemn promise that he made.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, the Province of Manitoba, a part which I have the honour to represent, over quite a number of years has experienced slow, steady growth. We have not had the booms of a province such as Alberta which experienced tremendous growth when the price of energy was high. We have not had the busts which the Province of Alberta saw when the price of energy collapsed. We have not had the booms which the Province of British Columbia had when the price of lumber and pulp and paper products were high. Nor have we had the decline which it has had.

The reason that we have had a slow and steady growth is that we have had, and have, a very diversified economy. We have a mining industry. We have a manufacturing industry. We have a food processing industry which is based on a very diversified agricultural community. It is because I know that so many of the people I represent work on jobs which are dependent upon a successful farming community in our province that I am very concerned about what this agreement between the United States and Canada will do for the farming community and for the farmers of my province.

● (1740)

The people that I represent work for the railways, the trucking industry, the farm equipment plants, the food processing plants, all of which are dependent upon the farming community of Manitoba. It saddens me when I see this Conservative Government turning its back on farmers in much the same way as the former Liberal Government did when it

forced through Parliament the Bill to change the Crow rate from a guarantee to Canadian farmers to a progressively diminishing subsidy for the movement of grain.

The signs of abandonment of our farming community are there for anybody who wishes to see. Branch lines are being torn up, farm incomes are collapsing, to a large extent because of the type of programs for U.S. farmers implemented by those so-called friends of ours in the United States. At the same time we are supposedly negotiating an agreement with them in good faith, and at a time when one would assume that if we are dealing in good faith there would be a continuation of the *status quo* between the two countries. The United States has used its grain export enhancement program in order that it can sell grain with the aid of tremendous subsidies to countries which have traditionally been customers for Canadian grain.

I see that the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds (Mr. Mayer) has come into the House. The other day he boasted about the fact that despite all our problems, our share of the sales of grain for export in the world market is still at 20 per cent.

Mr. Mayer: It is higher.

Mr. Orlikow: It is at 20 per cent because we had to subsidize at an increasing cost the sale of that grain to meet the subsidy programs of the United States and the European Economic Community. I say to the Minister that we could have 40 per cent of the world grain market if we gave the grain away for free.

Mr. Mayer: No, we could not, because we do not produce that much.

Mr. Orlikow: The point is that we can sell all the grain that we have for export if we are prepared to reduce the price that we charge.

We see this Government downgrading rural life by cutting back on services such as postal service which our farmers have had for many years. We see what is happening in our province to the farm community. We know how they feel about the situation when we look at reports that the number of students attending extension courses at the agricultural college are down in the last five years by 40 per cent. They have gone down because the sons and daughters of farmers who have farmed for generations in Manitoba—and the same is happening in the Province of Saskatchewan and other provinces—see that the future for farmers in Canada is bleak and that it would pay them to look elsewhere, to go away and to leave the farm.

This withering away of rural Canada is speeded up by the Government. We should realize that the rural decline in population that we have seen in Canada is accelerating at an ever-faster rate. In 1951, there were 2,800,000 people living on Canadian farms. That was over 19 per cent of our population. In 1981, this number had shrunk to 1 million or 4.1 per cent. The urban population, which in 1951 was 7.9 million, and by