

Mulroney) said he would make a statement in due time and all other Ministers abode by that.

What is important to us, Mr. Chairman, it is not whether the Space Agency is in Montreal or Toronto or Ottawa. What is important to us, Mr. Chairman, is that Canada be recognized as the high technology place, the place to develop aerospace. If we can have people in Saskatoon and Halifax working on high technology, aerospace products, people in Montreal will applaud, Mr. Chairman, they will support that, and those people will be able to promote the aerospace industry in Montreal.

I think that on this side of the House, all Members here, all Conservative Members share that view, and everyone is working for the good of Canada—everyone wants to promote Canada.

Mr. Chairman, as my time has expired, I would like to conclude by saying that the sooner the Bill is accepted, the sooner Canada will grow, the sooner the high technology industry in Canada will be improved, and the better it will be for Canadians, Quebecers and especially people in Laval.

● (0010)

[English]

Mr. Crawford: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the constituents of the riding of Kent for the trust and confidence they have placed in me. As a representative for the riding of Kent in southwestern Ontario, I pledge to go above and beyond the call of duty for my riding.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crawford: It is indeed an honour, a privilege, and a humbling experience to be a new Member of Parliament. In this my maiden speech in this hallowed Chamber, I am pleased to put forward my comments regarding the free trade deal in this historic debate, and particularly on how it may affect Kent. I wish to concentrate on three aspects or issues that are of specific concern to Kent: agriculture, the automotive industry, and the environment.

Kent County has some of the most fertile land in Canada, and it is number one in the nation for corn production. Day in and day out our farmers are confronted with things not under their control, such as the weather, low market prices, and high input costs. The trade deal puts at risk one of Canada's most basic industries, our food industry. The Government said that our supply-management boards are left intact by the

trade deal, but elimination of tariffs on processed foods will undercut Canadian poultry, eggs, and dairy marketing boards. As more processed foods are imported from the United States, the authority of Canadian marketing boards will weaken, and processors and farmers will lose business.

Article 401 will eliminate tariffs on fruit, vegetables, and processed foods. This will frequently make it difficult for our fruit and vegetable producers to compete with imports from the United States, especially the southern states which have a much longer growing season.

Our shorter grower season limits our ability to grow fruit and vegetables relative to the U.S. These products are generally in larger supply in the U.S. and at a lower price than in Canada. Therefore, because our food processors pay higher prices for Canadian than U.S. fruit and vegetables, by eliminating tariffs the trade deal obviously puts pressure on processors to relocate operations in the United States, closer to the source of cheaper supplies.

Our farmers are faced with more than Mother Nature, with more than the big banks breathing down their necks. Now the trade deal throws our farmers to the wolves.

The use of pesticides will be forever changed by the trade deal. Just as we are recognizing an urgent need to develop policies that move us away from a dependence on herbicides and pesticides, the free trade deal commits us to an American approach that actually makes it easier for certain pesticides and herbicides to be licensed.

Schedule 7 to Chapter Seven specifically concerns pesticides. It states that the U.S. and Canada must "work toward equivalent guidelines, technical regulations, standards and test methods". The difference between the U.S. and Canadian approaches are quite real. In the United States there are 20 per cent more active pesticide ingredients registered for use, and over seven times as many pesticide products.

One good example is the herbicide Alachlor, a probably cancer-causing substance which the U.S. continues to license, but it is banned in Canada. Alachlor, which has been demonstrated to cause tumours in test animals, has been found in both ground and surface waters across Canada. According to Health and Welfare officials, the evidence that it could be cancer-causing was the most convincing they had ever seen for a