

For instance, there are dairy marketing boards, and that is a supply-management commodity. On the other hand, there are marketing boards like the flue-cured tobacco ones, if that is the proper name for them, which do not have a system of supply-management. There are others like the pork producers marketing board which do not have a supply-management component.

This brochure itself cost \$350,000 to publish. However, the publicity surrounding this exercise will cost some \$12 million, as I said before. Those funds are being spent, and the farmers of my riding do not know whether the Tories across the way will negotiate, give away, and surrender our supply-management system. I say that to the Hon. Member for Gatineau and other Hon. Members across the way. They should be concerned about it. It is important for all Canada.

I should like to refer to another group which is very concerned about free trade. It is not getting any satisfaction from the Government. I am referring to egg producers. I received a package of information from them which contained a subparagraph entitled "Impact: 47 per cent of producers at risk" and indicated:

In order to determine the effect of free trade, the Canadian egg industry compared domestic farm costs with the cost of U.S. eggs transported to major Canadian markets. Canadian producers with costs above those of imported American eggs are at risk. Canadian producers with costs equal to or less than the U.S. landed cost are competitive.

If American eggs were allowed free access to Canada, 47.5 per cent or 930 Canadian producers would be at risk.

I do not want 930 farmers to be put out of business. It is bad enough that the present Government ended the moratorium on farm foreclosures. In the next 12 months 1,000 farms on which the Farm Credit Corporation holds mortgages will end up being the property of the Government of Canada, according to the information given by the FCC at committee yesterday. With that sad state of affairs, I do not want to see any more farmers in trouble.

*[Translation]*

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, farmers producing commodities that are now dependent on supply management do not want to see their marketing system traded away or otherwise dismantled in those free trade negotiations.

This is why it is important for this House to take a stand on this issue. It is important that I bring it to the attention of all members in this place.

Mr. Speaker, in October 1986, I received a statement from the Dairy Farmers of Canada, from which I will quote this one paragraph:

"Dairy Farmers wish to express hereby their solid conviction that any dismantling of or disruption in the overall policies and programs currently in place, including the milk supply management program, would be totally unacceptable."

This shows, Mr. Speaker, I am not alone in wanting to keep that system—producers themselves want it. And I urge the Government once more to state once and for all whether their

industry will be protected. I note unfortunately that my time is coming to an end, or very nearly so. I wish I had more time to comment on that important matter today.

• (1620)

*[English]*

I would like to bring another issue to your attention, Mr. Speaker. People in the dredging business in Canada have not been getting fair access to contracts in the United States or elsewhere. Most countries have protective measures to protect those who are in that dredging business. Here in Canada we do not. People in the dredging business in Canada, because of the Jones Act and other legislation in the U.S., cannot work in the U.S.A. At the same time, the Americans have free access to come here and they do so in connection with many large contracts. I invite the Government of Canada to think about issues like this. It is fine to talk here, as the Conservatives do, suggesting that we will give away this and that to the Americans, but it is time that we started to think that we do not have unfettered access to the American market. It is important for Canadians to assert our sovereignty and to ensure that the Government and the Prime Minister get the message that Members of this House do not want the PM to give away our country.

There are many important issues to be talked about in the free trade negotiations. I am not satisfied with the way things are going. The people whom I represent in the House of Commons are not pleased either. It is time that the Government started to sharpen up in the way it is handling this issue.

**Mr. O'Neil:** Mr. Speaker, it continues to amaze me to hear the indignation of the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) and members of the Opposition when they hear that the United States is speaking publicly about concessions that it wants to gain in these negotiations. It seems to me that that would be most predictable and it would be quite surprising if we did not hear Mr. Murphy, the U.S. negotiator, indicate what it is he wants from Canada. When Members speak in this House in the manner in which they do, such as the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, really they are helping Mr. Murphy in great style in his negotiations.

The Hon. Member spoke about the dredging problem. He makes the point about the need for stable, increased and ongoing access to the American market. That is what the negotiations are all about. There is no agreement to criticize. We were in the process of reaching an agreement. To suggest that Canadian farmers or any other group of Canadians will lose a, b, or c as a result of these negotiations is not only premature but it is also blatantly dishonest. These negotiations are taking place in an effort to achieve for all Canadians the opportunity to maintain and enhance economic opportunities.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, there was a comment by the Member but no question. However, I will comment briefly on