

and grow because of the unfair competition that it will be receiving from the United States.

● (1630)

The Hon. Member has raised a very important point. Unfortunately, we do not have the opportunity, because time does not permit it, to go through every sector of the agricultural community and every other sector which will be hit by the trade deal between the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and President Reagan. Perhaps, if time permits, we will have an opportunity to raise those points in another forum.

Mr. Caldwell: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to enter into the debate because I see that once again the opposition Parties are using the same tactics they have been using for the past several months, that is, to scare the daylights out of Canadians. This time they are trying to scare the farming community about what is entailed in the bilateral agreement.

They mentioned that it reduced the growth of supply management marketing boards. However, the Hon. Member did not point out how they would do that because it simply is not true. He talked about the numbers of chickens, turkeys, and eggs which will flow into Canada because of the agreement. It was simply not true, and he knows that. That is why they will not get into the detail of the agreement. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) also knows that, if he understands agriculture and understands how the supply management system in the country works. I am not sure that they know how it works; I do not think they know how it works.

They also talked about reduced growth in opportunities for Canadian fruit and vegetable producers. How will this happen? I do not know how it will happen. Canada has been a leader in the export of fruit and vegetables, and we will continue that.

I have a company located in my particular riding, the H. J. Heinz Company, which has been selling ketchup to the States for the last number of years. It is increasing that market because it is producing a premium product, and it will continue to do so despite the reduction of tariffs.

We also have the greenhouse industry in my particular area. It has opened up a whole new market. Rather than shipping to Montreal and Toronto, it will now be able to ship to Detroit, Chicago, and such areas duty-free. They are looking at that market and saying, "We are going to go for it".

The Hon. Member is not looking at the future of agriculture. Agriculture will change whether or not we like it. Ten years ago producers in my riding were shipping tomatoes in bushel baskets. Today they take them in huge wagons and water takes them out into the plant. That is what the difference is.

Ten years ago Members of the House of Commons did not know what a greenhouse cucumber looked like, these English cucumbers. People thought they were zucchini. Millions of

dollars in export sales are now taking place in that particular area.

The Hon. Member says that we are going to lose everything. He talked about his wine industry. I have a wine industry in my particular area. The producers of those wines—and I will give them a plug: Pelee Island wines, Charal wines, and Colio wines—have been doing very well. They are looking optimistically at shipping wine into the Detroit-Chicago market.

Mr. Langdon: Oh, come on!

Mr. Caldwell: The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor does not understand that. He wants to close the walls around Canada and never mind our \$2.7 billion in exports every year.

The Hon. Member also mentioned hogs and that the agreement would provide little benefit for red meat producers. What utter nonsense. Thirty per cent of our pork production now goes to the United States, some \$676 million worth of hogs last year. Do we not want access to that market, or do we once again close up the walls and produce for ourselves? Do we want to have Ontario producers cut back by 30 per cent? Do we want to put the people of Quebec who process this meat out of work or out of business?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time for questions and comments has expired, although I will give a minute or so to the other side—

Mr. St. Germain: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could we seek unanimous consent of the House to continue with the question and answer portion with the Hon. Member?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Had the Hon. Member ended his intervention?

Mr. Caldwell: Well, Madam Speaker—

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think it is more than appropriate to continue if that is the wish of Hon. Members. Certainly I am prepared to do so. However, I like to think of it as a question and answer period, not as a speech. If the Hon. Member wants to give a speech, presumably he will have an opportunity to do so. Let us make it a question and answer period so that we can have some dialogue back and forth.

Mr. Caldwell: Madam Speaker, I was only responding to some of the items which the Hon. Member raised. Because he left so many unanswered questions, I thought I had to fill in the blanks. I was not too sure whether he was aware of what it would do.