

*Supply*

part of the country for education. But the prospects are not good.

• (1040)

I think that in keeping with the new sense of co-operation that has been suggested should occur in this Chamber, that is expected from our constituents and from Canada, that passage of this motion will set an example of the co-operation that can exist to help take the country toward recovery. We recognize at the agriculture committee level and in our party that recovery cannot come about if rural areas are left destitute. This motion is urging the government to take some action so that that destitution is addressed.

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings):** Madam Speaker, I noted with interest some of the comments of the previous speaker. I would like to ask him a question. Unfortunately, we now have an NDP government in the province of Ontario. Farmers in the province of Ontario are going through a very tough time this year as well. The minister in Ontario has had the opportunity to take part in the NISA program, which is one way farmers can get some assistance, albeit it is not all that should come forward and all that is needed.

To date the minister in Ontario and the Government of Ontario has failed to participate in that program to the extent that they had. For a very small investment by the Government of Ontario, they could assist Ontario farmers in obtaining tremendous numbers of dollars to help see them through.

I just wonder if the hon. member would care to address why he thinks that the Ontario government is not as supportive of Ontario farmers as it could be, and should be, and needs to be.

**Mr. Althouse:** Madam Speaker, I cannot speak for the Government of Ontario but I would observe that the difference being discussed here is that \$100,000 worth of farm sales would amount to about \$500 of assistance. Five hundred dollars is not a huge amount.

What the Ontario minister seems to be attempting to do is get the debate shifted to a more major kind of general support. Instead he had already committed a certain amount of funds to debt reduction and managing of debt for those people who were having some problems financing and continuing in business for the year. He

thought that was more urgent at the time of the budget and that money has been expended.

I think that province, as all of the other provinces, is open to other suggestions. Ontario, and indeed all of the provinces, continue to make the point that the main hurt in this grain war has been as a result of external factors, international trade, questions of monetary policy, all of which are completely within federal jurisdiction. They are saying that their moneys are supposed to be spent for production programs and they have diverted their funds to managing to get another crop in to support the financing of the coming year's crop.

There is still an argument ongoing among a lot of the provinces with the federal government as to just whose responsibility it is. I think that is still going on and that this motion will help bring everyone back to the table to once again do something about addressing the tremendous net income shortfall that exists.

Perhaps \$300 to \$500 per farm would certainly be appreciated. The issue is much larger than that when you are looking at average incomes for families in the \$20,000 range, and there are farm incomes just over \$6,000. We have to use a much larger club than just the \$200 or \$300 response.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Madam Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the hon. member for Mackenzie. I applaud him for putting down this motion today because it is essentially the unanimous resolution that was put in the agriculture committee. He is in a position, because of his tremendous influence with the premier of Ontario and the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario to really pressure them for action.

What we are talking about here today is the third line of defence or emergency aid to compensate farmers for the extremely low farm incomes during the 1990-91 crop year. I know that we will have marvellous speeches from the Minister of Grains and Oilseeds to explain how there will be interim payments under GRIP and all of those things with names like FSAM and so on. The bottom line is how much funding is going to be provided as emergency compensation for the shortfall in incomes during 1990-91. Those shortfalls are to be shared by the federal and provincial government, whatever the arrangement may be.