

Supply

—the pact does allow U.S. imports to increase. That could steal away much of the fast food and processed chicken market from domestic producers. . . . Injury can occur very quickly. . . . We doubt investors will be willing to get into this area when they know the business could be lost.

In the same article, Gerald Green, President of the B.C. Fruit Growers Association, is reported as saying:

"It is the West's fruit and vegetable growers, especially in B.C., who will swallow the largest loss. American producers, industry spokesmen note, benefit from lower wages and favourable climate. It's most apparent in processing, where B.C. labour costs are 65 per cent higher than those of competitors in Washington State,"—

To say the least, there is a great deal of concern and skepticism in the agricultural community. By no means is it as solid in support of the deal in terms of agriculture as we are led to believe by spokespersons for the Government. Very grave reservations are held by members of the farming community and the processing industry.

Further, we deplore the Government's lack of action while seeing the spirit and the letter of the pact breached by the United States, before it has even been considered by the two countries, in the sales in traditional Canadian markets made under the U.S. Export Enhancement Program, to which I have already referred.

Our agricultural critic has already pointed out that the program has been entrenched in the U.S. Commodity Export Program with an unlimited budget. Instead of it being a temporary program, it is going to continue and expand.

How does the Government reconcile the activities of this kind of subsidized grain sales with the language of the agreement on the use of export markets to other subsidies? It does so simply by saying that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) will discuss it with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, and by saying, "Never mind that it means either loss of markets or lower returns or both to Canadian grain producers". Of course these are just the obvious subsidies to U.S. agricultural exports.

The agreement does not take into account the other subsidies in U.S. agriculture. How can the agreement, for example, take into account the billions of dollars of improvements which have been spent on upgrading the Missouri-Mississippi River system? It is a toll-free system, of course, but what about the money spent to make it a major grain-gathering right-of-way? How is that ever to be accounted for? Even if the continuing U.S. subsidies to agriculture are reduced—and they are several times the subsidies which Canadian agriculture receives—it will be over many years and only after an international agreement is reached. This possibility is very uncertain, given the legacy of many subsidies and capital improvements to agricultural infrastructure put in place by the Americans which will remain to our competitive disadvantage.

The Government will continue to blather about the level playing field reached with the United States while the Canadian agricultural industry is hit by loss after loss. No

wonder the agricultural and processing industries are becoming more skeptical the more they learn about the deal.

Let me conclude by listing some of the actions the Americans have taken since we began the negotiations. If there was good faith in trying to reach an agreement, I would assume that we would have had a continuation of the *status quo* while the discussions and negotiations were going on. That is how honest people who are serious would deal.

While the negotiations have been going on, the Americans have put countervail duties on softwood, shakes and shingles, steel pipe, potash, fish, specialized steel, and at least three farm products—hogs, strawberries, and grain. All of this was done while they were supposedly negotiating in good faith with us to reach an agreement which would be fair to both parties.

The Government has given away the store, and we certainly have no intention of supporting the proposal.

• (1800)

Mr. Gormley: Madam Speaker, I have a question which I will preface with a brief preamble. If one were to have watched the debate today one would have seen the unbelievable spectacle of western Members of the New Democratic Party criticizing the Government both on agriculture and on how free trade relates to agriculture, and people would have to ask several questions. First, are western Canadian farmers, the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, cynical, slow and gullible? Of course not.

There are those of us who really represent the aspirations of western farmers. Unlike the Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), who authored this outrageous motion today, and unlike the Manitoba Members, it is interesting to note the commitment of the New Democratic Party to agriculture.

In our Province of Saskatchewan, we clearly repudiated the NDP in two provincial elections. The NDP won one rural seat. In the Province of Manitoba where our Government of Canada has spent hundreds of millions of dollars, the provincial Government of Manitoba has spent \$83 million to support farmers. No federal or provincial Government has done so little to assist prairie agriculture.

While the Rome of agriculture burns, the fiddling is being done by the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) holding the violin and Bob White fiddling the bow.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gormley: If we assess carefully the question of agriculture as it pertains to free trade, it is clear from the major agricultural spokesmen and those of us who live in western Canada that there are considerable benefits to be directly derived from the free trade agreement. To have the Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre, who does not even live in his constituency or in the Province of Saskatchewan, stand up in this House and talk about prairie farmers and free trade is so