

*Adjournment Debate*

I did not see anything in the particular agreement which would back up any of the facts they have put forth. That was the point I was trying to make.

Where does he find the facts that say that it will reduce the growth of supply management marketing boards? Where does it say that in the agreement? Where does it say that it will adversely affect red meat producers? Where does it say that? I do not see where it says that in the agreement.

I ask him to point out in detail where these things are in the agreement, for example, that it will reduce the growth of supply management marketing boards? Where does it say that in the agreement? On what page?

**Mr. Riis:** Madam Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my hon. friend. He knows that we do not have an agreement before us. There is no agreement.

He asks where these things are in the agreement. He has not seen the agreement. Nobody has seen the agreement. I do not think, with all due respect, Madam Speaker, that even you have seen the agreement. That is what we are trying to say is part of the problem.

How are we to have an informed, intelligent debate, particularly across the country, and hear from the people who are directly involved, before we have an opportunity to view the agreement?

The question my hon. friend puts is where I get my information from. We attended briefing sessions. It is not in the document, which just contains some vague reference to the whole deal. There were briefing sessions by various sectors to inform Members of Parliament. We asked those questions, and representatives of the Government at government-sponsored hearings told us these things. That is where we got the information from.

My hon. friend also asked where those things were said in the agreement. They were not said in the agreement, and that is the precise point. What will the Government take across the country to hold hearings in Kent County or throughout the Niagara Peninsula on an agreement which not a single Canadian has ever seen? In a sense, I guess I am asking a question of my hon. friend.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE RAISED

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Lesick)—Agriculture—Edmonton food production inspection plant laboratory; the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North

Centre (Mr. Keeper)—Canada Post Corporation—Meeting protesting plans for future service/Women—position of Minister; the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Nuclear energy—Reported design flaws in United States Perry nuclear generating station.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 82—CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT—AGRICULTURE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Althouse:

That this House condemn the government for negotiating a trade agreement with the United States that has failed to stop the predatory practices of the U.S. Export Enhancement Program, and that will;

- (a) lead to the elimination of our two-price system for wheat;
- (b) undermine the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board;
- (c) reduce the growth of supply management marketing boards;
- (d) reduce the growth opportunities for Canadian fruit and vegetable producers;
- (e) adversely affect the Canadian wine and grape industry;
- (f) provide little benefit for red meat producers; and
- (g) provide no new benefit for farmers purchasing farm equipment or other farm inputs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Resuming debate—

**Mr. St. Germain:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have a question for the Hon. Member, and we had unanimous consent of the House to continue with the question period.

**Mr. Boudria:** No, no. It was for them.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** There was unanimous consent to continue the exchange between the Hon. Member for Essex—Kent (Mr. Caldwell) and the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis). There does not seem to be consent to continue now, so I think we should resume debate.

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that during the few minutes my colleague from Essex—Kent (Mr. Caldwell) spoke he demonstrated his knowledge of the agricultural sector, and on a sector by sector basis we are in a position to appreciate the obvious benefits flowing from such an agreement. Quoting figures right and left or resorting to scare tactics will not prove anything, such an approach can only be a source of concern for Canada's agricultural community. A closer look at the censure motion sponsored by our distinguished colleagues in the