little and could probably cost nothing in the end because interest rates rise as commodity prices rise.

The same thing applies to the current trade war. The Government does not give the impression that agriculture is a priority. There are too many things said, like the Government will spare no effort in seeking to protect the interests of Canada. What farmers want is for the Government to show its commitment. We cannnot have Canadian farmers receiving something less than $3 per bushel Canadian for wheat while American farmers are receiving something like $6 per bushel for their wheat and expect Canadian farmers to survive for very long.

The Prime Minister made a speech in Prince Albert on July 7, 1984, in which he said that the Conservative Government, if it was elected, would make Canada a super power in agriculture exports. Because Canadian farmers have been abandoned by the Government, they are today paying the full cost of simply surviving. The Government is not providing export subsidies in the way the U.S. Government does. The Government is not providing deficiency payments. It is fiddling around, talking about some kind of funding mechanism.

If the Government really wanted to have credibility with agriculture in western Canada—and in eastern Canada as well, because corn producers in southwestern Ontario are facing the same reductions in the value of their commodities as are the grain producers—it would move forward and these little exercises in publicity. It should really put its money where its mouth is. That is what we are waiting for the Government to do. Agriculture is a very important industry, and it deserves the complete support of all Canadians including the Government of Canada.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I do this by way of comment rather than by way of a point of order because I know that the Hon. Member did not do it intentionally. I just want to draw to his attention that during the course of his speech he used the phrase: "phony boloney," and then followed with the Prime Minister's name rather than his position or riding. Once again, I say that I am doing this in the spirit of bringing it to his attention rather than trying to interrupt his speech. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, the reason we do not use each other's names is to depersonalize the debate and keep it on as high a level as possible. This is an explanation that I heard from the former Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, Mr. Ian Deans as he now is, and I think it makes sense. As I say, I am sure the comment was inadvertent, but if we could continue to refer to people by their positions or ridings it will raise the level of debate and the level of the speeches in this place.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to congratulate the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) for giving, as usual, an excellent speech in the House of Commons. He has blessed us with an excellent speech again today.

Is it not ironic that on this very day that we are discussing agriculture and such very important issue as the export of agriculture, to which the Hon. Member for Algoma referred so eloquently only moments ago, the Government has tabled in the House of Commons that awful piece of legislation—pardon the language, Mr. Speaker. I know that is probably parliamentary, but I apologize for it anyway. The legislation the Government has introduced to abolish the Crown corporation Canagrex is awful. Would my colleague not agree with me that the Government should not proceed with the cancellation of Canagrex, particularly now that the U.S. Farm Bill is in place, with other legislation from other countries attempting to promote the export of agricultural products? Would the Hon. Member not agree with me that we in Canada should do our share for exports, and that a corporation like Canagrex could have been an excellent instrument for doing so, had it been given a chance?

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) has raised a very important issue, the question of agricultural exports. Clearly we are in a state of siege with regard to agricultural exports. We are faced with massive the United States instruments for assisting agriculture commodity exports. It is trying to take away our grain markets in Egypt and Syria. The United States has even put forward assistance to exports to China and Russia. Of course, many of those grain exports for which the Government is not providing any kind of assistance or subsidy are being captured totally by the farmer himself who puts his grain in through the Wheat Board at a lower price.

The Hon. Member refers to Canagrex, an agency which would be especially good for smaller commodities, those commodities that do not enjoy the same massive exports as dairy products or grain through the Canadian Dairy Commission or the Canadian Wheat Board. I refer to smaller volume commodities such as livestock, lentils, honey and a host of others. The value would not only arise from seeking out prospective markets, but in assisting in the co-ordination of activities with provincial governments. Often trade commissions include members from two provincial governments which sell the same commodity. A commodity-producer group could benefit through a national agency such as Canagrex.

• (1540)

I certainly agree with the Hon. Member. I hope the Government will not move to destroy Canagrex, because I believe it has a vital role to play in agricultural commodity export, especially at this time when we face tremendous trade wars in respect of agriculture.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, does my colleague remember the election promises of 1984? The Conservatives made numerous promises. I think I brought to your attention before that they made 338 promises. One promise was to establish a system of agribonds. The Hon. Member will recall, as I do, that there was an all-Party agreement to have an agribond system. This was recommended to the Government, it was subsequently neglected in two Budgets, and I saw no reference to it in this latest Throne Speech. Does my colleague want to give us his