

*Supply*

**Mr. Gustafson:** Mr. Speaker, anyone that would trivialize the size of the trade war and the impact it has had internationally, I would question whether he knows much about what is happening in international trade.

I said a few minutes ago that the subsidies paid by various governments around the world were \$299 billion and the European common market countries alone paid \$133 billion. There is some good reason for that.

A doctor from Austria, lumping us as Americans, said: "You Americans do not understand starvation. I've seen starvation three times in my life". With some reservations, there is no questions that the Europeans see food differently than North Americans. I am not blaming the Europeans entirely. The U.S. exports only 25 per cent of its product, whereas Canada exports 80 per cent of its coarse grains, wheats, durums and so on. It is a major problem.

Certainly we do not trivialize the problem. There has been one leading country, both through our trade minister and our Prime Minister. We just saw the implications of it when the Prime Minister visited the new President of the United States, Mr. Clinton. What was the topic? Trade.

I am sure that agriculture was talked about. Without a doubt this has been important. It is important that we—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. The time for questions and comments has now expired.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak on this motion today. It highlights many of the failures of this government, not all of them in agriculture, but certainly most of them. It is important that this kind of issue be aired on the floor of the House of Commons.

In commenting on the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, it is interesting that he tells us what a wonderful job the Prime Minister has done at international meetings of the G-7 with regard to the farm situation. If he is responsible for all the chaos that there is today in international trade and agriculture commodities, it is nothing to brag about.

The Prime Minister and his minions over in the Langevin Block do a great job of telling us what a wonderful job the Prime Minister is doing on international trade issues. Where are the results?

Even in 1986 the Prime Minister's Office was putting out press releases saying that he had gone to the G-7 meeting in Japan to solve these problems. He put it all forward and he was going to lead on to the great successes of the Uruguay round. The press release from the G-7 meeting in Tokyo, Japan, in early May 1986 never mentioned one word. He made a great impact if the communique from the G-7 meeting in Tokyo, Japan, never even mentioned it.

• (1120)

The parliamentary secretary tells us what a wonderful job the Prime Minister has done in assisting Canadian agriculture. Would he trade Canadian agriculture as it is today for what it was in 1985 when this government came to power? Thirteen thousand fewer farmers are in business today. The debt levels in Saskatchewan are horrendous. The Farm Credit Corporation owns more land than probably even the banks. Half the bankruptcies, 51 per cent, approximately 220 bankruptcies in 1991 were on Saskatchewan farms. The situation is really dismal.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister put forward the canard that the Prime Minister has led us into some great promised land in agriculture. What a disaster. Show me one sector of Canadian agriculture that feels confident. Show me farmers that are not desperately concerned they are either going to lose their farms or they are going to lose the viability of their farms today and I will show you farmers who do not make their incomes from farming.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool people are going to be here tomorrow meeting with caucuses of the House. The average price of grain in Saskatchewan is something like \$2 a bushel, 50 per cent of the grain is feed grain because of the quality.

The parliamentary secretary blames the NDP government in Saskatchewan for changing the GRIP. That criticism is well placed. Two farmers, the former minister and Mr. Williams who both have now left agriculture portfolios, made the agreement. Surely two politicians, even though they are from different parties, could sit