

of the American Embassy or other embassies within the National Capital Region. Selection criteria often vary with each case. The National Capital Commission has hired consultants to prepare a full proposal for the relocation of the U.S. Embassy based on site selection criteria developed by the United States Government and the National Capital Commission. If the consultants determine that the Mile Circle is indeed the appropriate location for the American Embassy, a report will be presented to the Minister for his review and consideration at that time.

I therefore ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his motion.

SECURITY REQUIREMENTS OF NEW AMERICAN EMBASSY

Motion No. 21—**Mr. Turner (Ottawa—Carleton):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of any report made to the Minister of Public Works concerning the exact security requirements of the United States State Department and all Canadian investigations for the security needs of the proposed site for the new American Embassy within the Mile Circle in Ottawa, Ontario.

Mr. Ron Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, to date there has been no report made to the Minister of Public Works concerning the exact security requirements of either the United States State Department or the responsible Canadian security authorities for the security needs of the proposed site for the new American Embassy within the Mile Circle in Ottawa, Ontario.

I therefore ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Speaker: Further to the request of the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Carleton, Motions Nos. 20 and 21 are transferred for debate, subject to Standing Order 73.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 82—AGRICULTURAL STABILITY—IMPACT OF CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma) moved:

That this House urges the Government to take immediate and firm action on behalf of Canadian farmers to ease the burden of debt by introducing such measures as court-ordered debt review, a meaningful interest relief program and an increased commitment to research, and further urges the Government to make firm commitments now to Canadian farmers that they will not be harmed or their interests sacrificed in its comprehensive trade negotiations with the United States and to provide a strong response to difficulties expected as a result of the U.S. Farm Bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak this afternoon on the U.S. Farm Bill. I do not think there has been a time in the last 50 years when agriculture in Canada has faced a more difficult period. Clearly the motion is designed to draw the attention of the House to the gravity of the agricultural situation in Canada and in many ways around the world. We want to examine the lack of adequate response by the Government, and the direction the

Supply

Government is giving on the issue of agriculture. I will also talk about the impact which I think has resulted because of the Government's public relations technique in dealing with this grave situation.

Certainly the Government's commitment to agriculture has been called into question as the Standing Committee on Agriculture, the subcommittee on grain, and other agricultural committees have travelled across the country. Farmers have seen what the banking industry and others have received in the past year, but they have not seen the same action, commitment and reaction to the crisis which they face. I believe it really boils down to a lack of trust in the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) himself.

A couple of weeks ago the Prime Minister announced some agricultural initiatives in Ottawa about which I will talk more fully later this afternoon. He flew to Vancouver and met with a few agricultural representatives, but he did not stop on the Prairies to discuss the details of his proposal. I suspect he did not do that because he knew it was a public relations job and there was very little in his announcement at that time.

Let us talk about the gravity of the situation faced by farmers. The latest figures of the Farm Credit Corporation show that some 39,000 or 40,000 farmers are in serious financial difficulty, and that 18,000 or 20,000 of them are in rather severe financial difficulty. These figures are out of a total of some 170,000 farmers with over \$20,000 of production per year. If we look at the brief provided by the FCC to members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, we see that the arrears situation of the corporation has increased dramatically during the past year. This is an indication that farmers simply cannot meet their payments.

This past week the agricultural committee on the domestic price of wheat visited Saskatchewan and was told that the farm income in that province had dropped every year since 1981. The Saskatchewan pool elevator group has indicated that net farm incomes have dropped below \$5,500 a year on the average in that province. Farm debt in Saskatchewan has increased from \$3 billion in 1982 to \$5 billion this year. Those are devastating, frightening and concerning figures. It is clear that action is required by the Government of the day.

● (1540)

We are concerned with those figures indicating that net farm income has dropped by 14 per cent in 1985, because we have seen the international trade war for farm commodities, especially between the European Economic Community and the United States, accelerating during the past four or five months. We have seen the whole issue heat up with the United States Congress having voted an estimated \$52 billion U.S. for subsidization and assistance to farmers over the next three years. In fact, some observers have suggested that figure may rise to \$60 billion or \$70 billion U.S., or \$100 billion in Canadian funds, to subsidize and assist American farmers during the trade war over the next three to five years on commodities such as wheat, corn, red meat and so on. Our