

*Canagrex*

make the claim that they had a part in dismantling it will go home to a hero's welcome.

● (1650)

It was unaccepted in the regions of the country for two reasons. First, they did not want the inefficiency which attaches itself to government structuring and organizations which only Liberal and NDP Members can envision as being fruitful. Second, Canagrex in and of itself was destroying by the buy-sell clause the very mentality of the farm community across Canada—the enterprising nature and spirit of those persons. It is on those two principles that this issue is following. It is those two issues which the Parties opposing the dismantling of Canagrex do not understand.

**Mr. Althouse:** Do you prefer that farmers give it away?

**Mr. Malone:** The Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) should know that since we have taken the money away from Canagrex, Canada has increased its sales of agricultural products abroad. In the area of grain we have made more contracts, not less. In other markets we have moved in to sell more. The Hon. Member stands here trying to pretend, as would a member of the NDP, that if he sees a problem or thinks there is one, the thing to do is to build another government tower for another staff or another bureaucracy. They hope, as did the Liberals for 15 years or 20 years, that it will somehow be a symbol for the people. They think that the people can be given a building and a staff of bureaucrats and that somehow the problem will go away. The truth of the matter is that the Progressive Conservative Government and its caucus members believe that we have all the instruments within the Department and other Departments of Government to do effectively everything Canagrex is doing and save Canadian taxpayers \$6 million.

Members of the Opposition would rather have spent the \$6 million. They would rather have had a building so that they could say that the building and its bureaucrats would be out there trying in some way. We have had a rendition of Eugene Whelan's speeches to try to persuade us to retain Canagrex. That is its own unpersuasiveness. It was under that stubborn administration that the buy-sell clause could not be removed, and that buy-sell clause was offensive. In my province, and very particularly in my constituency, we would have lost \$2 million with the buy-sell clause in the Canagrex organization in exports by the Alberta Swine Breeders Association to Mexico and the Pacific Rim.

The opposition Parties laud this wonderful organization. They say that it would have enhanced agricultural exports. It would have destroyed parts of the country with the buy-sell clause because it would have destroyed the private initiatives which could have taken place around the world.

**Mr. Althouse:** No.

**Mr. Malone:** I hear the groan of the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre. He thinks it would not have

happened. I do not know why that Hon. Member, who lives in my constituency, flew down here. Surely he would have done enough research. Why have organizations in the Province of Alberta, with the exception of the NFU, been making representations day after day? Why would they do that and fly down here if there was no concern? In his speech the Hon. Member said there was no reason for concern. There was a reason for concern, and that is why it is going.

**Mr. Althouse:** Why didn't they kill the provincial agencies which had those powers?

**Mr. Malone:** Also the Hon. Member said in his speech that this was like a funeral or a wake. This is the happiest funeral I have ever been at. The "awake" will come when he goes home and his constituents find out that he tried to retain that national government organization which would make Canagrex sit at the desk with farmers as they arrange their management programs. He wanted a buy-sell clause which would ensure that everything was done through the Government of Canada rather than by independent entrepreneurs making farm decisions in the way farmers want.

I listened to the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster). He tried to leave the impression that destroying Canagrex was the first thing that we as a Government had done for Canadian agriculture. There is not enough time in the rest of this week to outline what we have done for agriculture. More than 317 initiatives have been undertaken by the Progressive Conservative Government for some \$5.6 billion. The best the Liberals could have done in a four-year period was \$2 billion in agricultural assistance. We have a commitment for \$1 billion more in payments which will go to farmers because of crop conditions this year, so the amount of assistance we have provided is approaching \$7 billion. No Government in the history of Canada has made such a severe commitment to our grain producers.

I will not list all our achievements. When Hon. Members rise and defy the fact that there has been the removal of the farm fuel tax, the fact that there is a \$500,000 capital gains exemption, the fact that amendments were made to the Western Grain Stabilization Act which put money into the hands of prairie farmers, and the fact that there have been some 317 different achievements, they are not being very frank with their constituents back home. However, that does not concern me so much because I know that in farm communities there is a recognition that while world conditions are very difficult, they have a Government which is sensitive and is trying to make agriculture work effectively for them.

Let us talk about the international market. The most important thing we can do is to make the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade accept the notion that what is happening universally is unfair to food producers. We would expect not to have the continual pretending of opposition Members that nothing is being done. We would expect them to shoulder the wheel in the interests of food producers. We would expect them to applaud the actions of the Prime Minister (Mr.