

tabled? What do you think is the long-term future for dairy and poultry in Canada?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I am glad my colleague raised that issue. I had actually forgotten to mention that part of it when identifying what those prices have been over the last few years and their actual reflection of world prices, or at least what we normally understand as being world prices.

We are looking at the area of eggs particularly. I will use that example because it was raised this morning at a meeting that we had on prices that were abnormally low for the last three years. We are starting off with that base which is artificially low in the case of egg prices.

We are also using prices that were in effect in a period of the post-U.S. farm bill, if I can call it that. I think the actual date of implementation of the U.S. farm bill of 1985 was January 1, 1986. The U.S. farm bill contributed some \$70 billion U.S. in farm subsidies so that the U.S. could recapture what it thought was its so-called rightful share of the world market.

What happened, of course, is that grain prices and the prices of a number of commodities were artificially lowered by the subsidies brought in by the United States. It follows quite reasonably from that that if prices are lowered on feed grain and beef—which has happened as a result of the U.S. farm bill and the so-called whole herd buy-out program—then prices are deflated on many agricultural commodities, not just those two. In the case of feed, obviously that is a product that is fed to the other animals, and in the case of beef it is a competitor to other meat products. When you lower the price of one, you lower the price of the others at the same time.

What we have, in fact, is an artificially low price period. That period of time is then utilized to make this base. Obviously the base is going to be incorrect. It is going to be artificially low.

To make matters worse, we do not have a similar low cost period to compare with in Canada because we did not have many of these exaggerated subsidies that they had south of the border. So we are comparing apples with oranges. To make matters even worse, as my colleague has pointed out, the input costs, property taxes, fuel costs, minimum wages and social benefits are different in Canada than in some of the U.S. states. A

Supply

further dimension to that is we have the climatic differences to deal with.

We may be good producers. We may be smart people in Canada, but we cannot recreate the weather of Louisiana and Georgia no matter how smart we are.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. The hon. parliamentary secretary for employment and immigration.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate many of the sentiments expressed in the motion we are considering today. I understand the desire to achieve full employment in this country, and I too believe that Canada's future is dependent on our international competitiveness.

Furthermore, I respect the wish to sustain our nation's development. That is why I endorse the principle of investing training dollars in Canadian men and women. I believe it is vital to develop their skills and to provide them with training and retraining opportunities that will allow them to participate fully in our economy. I believe this, because like everyone else in this government, I am determined to build a strong and competitive future for our great country.

I would like to point out that although this motion before the House contains many commendable features, the wording displays a disturbing inability to grasp the complexities of our labour market. The motion boldly claims that our labour market programs are a failure. That is simply a distortion of the facts. This government has always understood the importance of investing in our citizens. Indeed, we are at this very moment making the very types of social investments this motion claims that we are failing to fashion.

These investments come in the form of training and retraining Canadian workers in programs offered through the Canadian Jobs Strategy and our Labour Force Development Strategy. To suggest, as this motion does, that we have failed to provide Canadians with appropriate employment opportunities distorts the reality of our training record.

Indeed, we have always maintained that the failure to preserve a competitive work force would have a direct consequence, not only for the individuals who have lost their jobs, but for Canada's international economic prospects as well. That is why we have dedicated more dollars to job training and skill enhancement than any