

• (1540)

The truth is that the government is not defending the interests of Canada's producers. If it was, it would not be cancelling programs such as this which help maintain our export markets in the face of continued use by the U.S. and others of programs like the Export Enhancement Program which funded grain exports to the tune of \$1.5 billion in 1988, \$0.7 billion in 1989, \$566 million this year, and over \$900 million proposed for 1991.

A month ago, the Minister of Agriculture might have looked on these statistics as some kind of victory. He might very well have said of these statistics: "Look, the Export Enhancement Program has been cut. U.S. subsidies are declining." But only because the U.S. felt its markets could be defended at that rate. The U.S. doubled it for 1991 and, if they thought tomorrow that they would need to double again to maintain their markets, they would double it again. If they had the grain to export, they would double it.

The Canadian Wheat Board is no longer issuing permits for Durum exports because of charges that the U.S. importers were exporting Canadian grain under the U.S. export enhancement program. With regard to subsidies, did the Government of Canada say to the United States: "No, we won't do as you say, we will do as you do"? No, they didn't. They said: "Sure, we will do as you say, we will cancel our export assistance programs, and you just go ahead with your export enhancement program and commodity loan programs." And the government still has the nerve to say it is defending Canada's interests at the GATT.

The government chose to accept the report on ice cream and yogurt at the GATT. It could have refused to accept that report. It could have used that refusal to defend the interests of the dairy farmers of Canada. It could have used the refusal to negotiate a strengthening of Article 11, but it did not.

To this government the GATT is not a place of tough negotiations. It is not the GATT, it is the "GIVE". That is how the government negotiates for agriculture, by giving up our rights and our programs.

However, this point might be moot, for by 1992 when the latest GATT round of negotiations is complete, Canadian agriculture will have nothing left to negotiate with, if the next three budgets are like the last one.

### *Government Orders*

There will be no government agricultural programs left and no orderly marketing left to defend.

What is happening must be clear to members opposite. If you have no storage capabilities, you cannot operate an orderly marketing system. By removing all the programs that allow producers to be able to afford to store crop, you force all the product on the market at once. You create a glut and orderly marketing is finished.

In 1980, there were 3,324 grain elevators in western Canada. Now there are only 1,619. Storage capacity in western Canada has shrunk from 8.76 million tonnes to only 7.1 million tonnes. The government has eliminated assistance in storing costs provided by the Advance Payments for Crops and the Prairie Grain Advance Payments. Now the at and east. What is left?

The *Toronto Star* reported that the elevators at Port McNicoll in Ontario will be blown up this spring, lessening storage facilities in Ontario by over 300,000 tonnes because of the cancelling of the at and east. It is not critics blaming the loss of the facilities on the cancelling of the at and east but the company that owns the elevators. One hundred jobs in Port McNicoll will be lost, a third of the town's tax base, let alone the damage that this will inflict on the orderly marketing of grain in Ontario.

A Minister of Transport report described the number one benefit of the program to the Ontario Grain Producers as "The at and east route helps to more efficiently utilize the limited storage and elevator space in the Georgian Bay-Great Lakes Region." Cancelling this program has already only further diminished the existing elevator space.

In the minister's green paper, he mentions the need for agriculture to be sustainable. In order to have sustainable agriculture, that literally means production within reasonable limits of what the environment can sustain over an indefinite length of time. There must be a system of orderly production and to have that you must have a system of orderly marketing.

You must have a pricing mechanism that provides a reasonable return for the producer and which allows the producer to use the land and the environment in a sustainable manner, not in an exploitive manner.

By removing the programs that assist in meeting storage needs, you undermine both of these things because they are interdependent. Gluts cause unreasonable returns which encourage the exploitation of the