accepted the amendment proposed by the NDP to ensure that Canagrex would be operated as a businesslike organization and that it would be held accountable not only to the public, but also to Parliament itself. The Auditor General went on to commend us for including that amendment so that we could be assured that the operation would function well.

One thing has disturbed me from the time this Bill passed second reading stage. I believe the Hon. Member who raised this matter yesterday under the provisions of Standing Order 43 was quite correct when he said; "All of a sudden, there is a change of heart in the Official Opposition". In order to meet those fears, we amended the Bill so that Canagrex could not in any way enter into agricultural production except in the case of a joint venture or at the request of Governments, Canadian companies, co-operatives, marketing boards or associations of other Canadian enterprises. We met that request to ensure that this could not possibly happen.

Another story which is being circulated is that Canagrex will take over land through the provision to own property. We have plugged that loophole. There is no possibility of that happening.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Ferguson: The only way it can possibly own property is for its headquarters or warehouses.

Mr. Mazankowski: Macdonald said you'd never buy a service station, either.

Mr. Ferguson: We have met the objections of the various Members of the Opposition but they still want to stall because they realize the potential of this Bill. It could provide more markets for our export products and bring back our previous level of prosperity.

The "Food Market Commentary" for September, 1981, stated:

> In fruit and vegetable canning and flour and breakfast cereals, foreign-owned plants control over 60 per cent of the shipments. That extent of foreign ownership raises the concern that such firms might not compete aggressively against their parent firms in third markets.

Another reason that we must proceed with this Bill and get it into effect is that our own producers, in the downturn of the economies of countries of the western world, may be left out in the cold by some of these foreign-owned parent companies.

I would also like to take issue with some of the points raised by some people with regard to what has been happening in the area of trade. The Annual Report of the Canadian Export Development Corporation, just tabled a few weeks ago, stated:

> Those who lost market share. This applies to Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Italy and Sweden.
>
> Canada appears to have undergone the largest relative decline; and this happened at a time when the world market for these products had grown approximately five-fold.

If the existing system was doing so well and the market had increased by approximately five-fold, why did Canada's exports decline?

Mr. Lewis: Because of the Minister.

Mr. Ferguson: A statement released by the executive director of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association states:

> —our export performance as an industry is impressive and, if not fully satisfactory, would not be improved by Canagrex.

However, I cannot understand for the life of me why the Association would make such a statement, because we are in a deficit position as far as the production of dressed beef is concerned. We imported $178 million worth of dressed beef while we exported $142 million worth in 1981. We are also in a deficit position concerning our exports of live beef. We imported $133 million worth and exported $110 million worth. However, in comparison, consider what the horse meat people have done. They have a net export figure in the amount of $41 million. What in the world is wrong with the Canadian Cattlemen's Association which would allow this to happen?

Consider the hog producers. We have exports of dressed pork amounting to $349 million and imports amounting to $42 million. There is something desperately wrong when this type of thing can go on.

Mr. Taylor: The Liberal Government is wrong.

Mr. Ferguson: The Liberal Government has nothing to do with it. We must go on and consider what is happening. People are waiting for this legislation. The Minister has been criticized for bringing in time allocation with regard to this particular Bill, not by closure but, rather, by Standing Order 75C.

Mr. Lewis: They snuck it in.

• (1640)

Mr. Taylor: It was snuck in.

Mr. Ferguson: They call it sneaking it in. I don't. I have a telegram from the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers Marketing Board. It reads:

> —an 11 million pound export sale ... hinges on the passage of this Bill plus the possibility of a further ten million pounds export sale.

Surely when we see opportunities like this in front of us, we should be taking action as the Parliament of Canada to make sure that we exploit the potential we have as Canadians. We should work together to improve not only the economic position of the Canadian farmer but the spin-off effects which are going to resound through our whole economy. The increased sale of agricultural equipment will put workers back to work in the farm machinery industry, and help the farm machinery dealers in the tight squeeze they find themselves in at the present time. I believe we have the potential here in Canada. We are respected as an exporting nation.

Producers from western Canada have the Canadian Wheat Board. In his book "The Merchants of Grain", the author, Dan Morgan, describes the Canadian Wheat Board as "the most sophisticated marketing system of any country in the world". We do not have the advantage of that in eastern