

• (1800)

The second endorsement came from one of my opponents in the 1993 election. He was in Ottawa this week. He said that the payment to landowners represents a reasonable compromise. It is not often that the three of us agree on anything, but miracles do happen in Manitoba and a miracle did happen in this instance.

Let me reiterate that although the government has cut spending dramatically, it has been done the cutting in a way which is consistent with the values of Canadians, promoting jobs and growth, protecting the west, protecting the most vulnerable in society and cutting the government purse.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke a lot about agriculture. It warrants a lot of attention, because relations between farmers and markets in Quebec and Canada will be changed significantly by some of the measures presented.

I have a question for him on one type of production that is growing considerably in Canada: lamb production. Alberta, Quebec and Ontario are the three largest producing provinces. The government has decided to close the experimental farm at La Pocatière, which is in my riding. It is the only experimental farm with a national mandate to do research on everything that concerns sheep. Sheep production is growing, and production should increase, because there is a demand for sheep and lamb in Canada production as a whole.

Are there other solutions in the member's opinion? Shutting down the farm and putting an end to research into this sort of production does not seem acceptable to me. In one way it is very dangerous. I would like to know if he sees any alternatives. In fact, both his region and mine are affected by this decision, which has a significant negative impact on production of this type.

[English]

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. Its thrust is similar to other segments of agricultural industry. I look at it in a similar fashion to hog production in Manitoba.

It is my understanding in terms of research that the thrust of the department is to attempt to put together partnerships involving the federal government, as well as specific provincial jurisdictions where there is great interest. More important, it is producers who are probably the most concerned about the genetic development of hogs, sheep or cattle and who may be addressing the markets on a global basis.

The best way to answer the question would be to indicate that the producers should be looking at bringing together their resources. Perhaps a check off system at the marketing end would help to address those concerns.

Supply

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the hon. member opposite dealt mostly with Bill C-76, the Budget Implementation Act, and not so much with the estimates.

Since he is talking about budget implementation, I wonder if he would detail for me, because I am not as familiar with the red book as he would be, exactly how close was the red book promise on the WGTA with what the Budget Implementation Act actually did? That was to remove the WGTA. Was that the red book promise? Was there a different promise on the WGTA?

• (1805)

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, references were made to transportation and the WGTA in the red book.

I have to be honest. When I started into the campaign in 1993, a debate was going on about how transportation should be handled in various regions of the country, remembering that there is always a moving target. Conditions did change. We were facing as a government, possibly, circumstances that were not envisioned during the campaign. I will be succinct. In 1993 I was not of the view of the route on which the government has proceeded. We have had to rethink that whole circumstance.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for those watching this debate. We are now debating a Bloc motion on grants and contributions from the human resources department's main estimates. The Bloc motion calls for \$1.3 billion in cuts. Those cuts would cover programs, everything from youth initiative programs to employment assistance programs.

We are all making do with less in these times and government should be no exception. Even though this message is coming from Canadians, the government is not listening. Instead it has actually increased its spending in its first two budgets. This includes substantial increases in its interest spending. The government keeps borrowing money and having to increase spending on interest but it decreases spending on some other things for which we would rather pay.

The Reform approach in dealing with the main estimates for the human resources department was to propose modest 5 per cent reduction in the operating expenses of the various programs under this department. Instead the human resources estimates propose significant increases in spending. This is interesting because it is at a time when the services being delivered by these programs are being significantly cut back to Canadians.

For example, we know that pensions are going to be cut back sometime. That has been announced. We are not sure when or what. We know that unemployment benefits are being cut back. The budget said a minimum of 10 per cent but it could be more than that. We know that health care is being cut back under the Liberal budget. We know that tuition fees are rising because