

Canagrex

Producers Marketing Board, the Canadian Pork Council, the Canadian Horticultural Council, the Ontario Flue Cured Tobacco Marketing Board, the Ontario Wheat Producers Marketing Board and the Ontario Soybean Growers.

Associations, which supported the Bill providing minor modifications were made, include the Canadian Food Processors Association, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, the Alberta Swine Breeders, the Manitoba Cattle Producers, the Alberta Cattle Feeders, the P.E.I. Potato Marketing Board, the Alberta Beekeepers Association and the Western Stock Growers.

In direct response to the Member's question, not only large private corporations supported the deal, it was also supported by such groups as the Union des Producteurs Agricoles du Québec which represents practically every farmer in that province. It had very wide support, as I am sure the Hon. Member knows.

Mr. Malone: Madam Speaker, it is imperative that that which is absolutely and totally false not be allowed to stand in the House of Commons. The Western Stock Growers Association adamantly opposed Canagrex, as does the Alberta Swine Growers Association. For political reasons the Member chooses to put on the record the initial reaction when the Bill was announced. Those reactions were reversed when the Bill was studied, and there was massive opposition from the organizations which the Member says support this Bill. They sent delegations to Ottawa to tell Canadian parliamentarians to oppose that Bill. What he refers to as insignificant and modest changes were changes in the buy-sell clause which was offensive and wrong and put the independence of Canadian agriculture under government control in Ottawa. He may call that small, but that is why the Canadian farm community reacted with the distaste and disgust with which it did. It is unfortunate that a Member would put on the record of the House of Commons things which he knows are absolutely false.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, had the Member listened instead of heckling, as he did for most of the time that I was speaking, he would have heard me list those organizations which indicated support at the time the original Bill was presented. If he spent more time listening and less time talking in this House he would have heard that. I invite him to review *Hansard* tomorrow and apologize later.

Mr. Foster: Madam Speaker, I am interested in the comments of the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria). I think there is a deliberate move by the Government to do everything it can to hurt the agriculture industry. We need only look at the \$23 million cut in the budget for agriculture research this year. It is clear that the Minister had the ground cut out from under him by the Prime Minister's office and the office of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) on black Thursday, November 8, 1984. It was a decision by the Department of Finance and the Prime Minister's Office.

• (1250)

In his testimony before the Agriculture Committee, the Minister of Finance apologized for this decision being taken by the Government. He also phoned the President of Canagrex, Mr. Ed Story. Obviously, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) is screaming his view because the Tory caucus was very divided on this issue and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) was in opposition—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) but the time for questions and comments has terminated. Resuming debate.

Hon. Charles Mayer (Minister of State (Canadian Wheat Board)): Madam Speaker, let me congratulate you on your new position. I look forward to working with you in the House and I know you will do an excellent job.

Many things have been said this morning that I believe cannot go unchallenged. In many ways it is unfortunate that the Opposition chooses such a tone in this debate because, while there are problems in Canadian agriculture as everyone knows, I believe that any fair minded person would have to admit that the Government is making an effort to address those problems. I can give specific details of those efforts if the occasion rises.

However, when one hears the Opposition come on as strongly as it does, and indicate that nothing is being done in light of some very significant problems, surely it is not doing a service to Canadian farmers, to the House or to anyone who takes pride in being associated with this institution. I say that more in sorrow than in anger.

Let me suggest to Hon. Members opposite that they would serve the people whom they represent and would serve the House much better in debate if they were to talk about some of the things that the Government has done. While they may be critical of the Government, they should at least recognize some of our accomplishments.

For example, they can talk about what we are doing for our export markets internationally. Last year, there was good news as far as the export of Canadian agricultural products was concerned. Members of the Official Opposition should know that last year Canada's share of wheat exports actually rose.

Mr. Boudria: That was before the U.S. Farm Bill.

Mr. Mayer: The Hon. Member should listen and put into practice some of the suggestions he makes for our side. That is after the U.S. BICEP Program and the Farm Bill had been in effect for about a year. We told the Americans when they were contemplating the U.S. Farm Bill that we did not think it would work, because a farmer's normal reaction to lower prices is to increase production and maintain revenue by having more volume at lower total revenue. That has in fact been borne out, because last year Canada's share of total wheat exports went up while the American share went down.