

*Supply*

of poultry meat? The turkey agreement is similar but I am just referring to poultry at this point.

● (1250)

**Mr. Wise:** Madam Speaker, I answered that question on a couple of occasions. I put that question to a senior official at the trade office. If I can recall, he indicated to me it was not a rolling average, not a moving average. I will give an undertaking to the Hon. Member that I will double-check that today or tomorrow. If I am wrong, I will communicate that to the Hon. Member.

However, we must remember a couple of things. The new percentages are up slightly, 1.5 per cent the highest and .012 per cent the lowest. That is very small. What those increases do is simply reflect the amount of product that has been imported from the United States into Canada over the last five years, not unilaterally at all. If the food processing industry is short of product, does the Hon. Member want to lose a market opportunity? Does he want to shut down a product line? Does he want to lay people off? I do not think so.

If the Canadian system cannot at that given time supply the product, the processor applies for an import permit to keep the product line operating, to keep people employed. They go to the national agency and ask, "Can you people supply this product to the processor?" That is not a combative meeting. They search the market-place. If they can supply it from Canadian sources, they put it into that processing. If they cannot supply it, they tell us to issue the permit. We always check with the agency to see if they have any problems if we issue an export certificate, which is not issued by myself but by the Minister for International Trade. But she picks up the phone and she talks to me. We communicate with one another.

Why was that done for the past five years? It was done to keep the Canadian food processors in business. Everyone benefits. That is exactly what the system is going to do in the future.

With respect to an increase in the market, if the Canadian industry can supply it, it will be supplied by the Canadian industry. That has always been the case and will continue to be the case. However, there will be times when the Canadian industry is not in a position to supply the product. We have full control over that under Article 11 of the GATT because that is one of the underpinnings which is necessary for the day-to-day operations of supply management.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise). While I believe he is basically an honourable Member and an honourable man in that he believes strongly in agriculture, I believe he has been betrayed by his Cabinet colleagues, and what I have to say is not a reflection on him as a person.

I think the Hon. Minister should have called his speech on the free trade deal with the United States, "The moment that

the Government of Canada abandoned the family farm in Canada". That would have been a more appropriate title for his speech, because what we have found by listening to the Minister of Agriculture is that the Government of Canada had decided to abandon farm families, the family farm, family enterprises, family processors and rural Canada. That is what this Government has just declared to the people of Canada.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, that it seems to me we have come to a very critical question. Has the Government decided to support the family farm or is it prepared to abandon the family farm and turn it over to corporate enterprise or, more appropriately, to the United States? We now know that the Government has decided to abandon the family farm and the rural communities that built Canada and has given them to the United States. I want to take the next few minutes to explain why I feel this ultimate betrayal has taken place.

First, we find that the Government has decided to hold hearings across Canada on this deal. Presumably we will go across the country holding hearings in a variety of communities, but based on what? We have not seen the deal yet? We have not seen the free trade deal with the United States. We will not see it this week or next week. We will not see it until the end of November or the first part of December. Yet the committee is expected to hold hearings across Canada based on what? There is no document.

That is like asking the House of Commons to debate a Bill that is not on our desk, to debate legislation the Government has failed to introduce. How can we do this? Yet the Government's decision is to hold hearings on the most serious economic matter facing this country, by the Prime Minister's own words, the biggest trade deal in Canadian history, and no one will have seen the deal. No one will have seen the deal that presumably our negotiators initialed early in October. If that is not the con job of the century, if that is not the sideshow of the decade, to have our parliamentarians going out to hear key witnesses on an agreement no one has read or seen, then what is?

Let us identify this scam that is underway. This is the style Canadians have become used to. It is Mr. Mulroney's style.

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Riis:** It is his style to make the decision at the eleventh hour, at one minute before midnight, when we do not have adequate facts before us, but push Canadians up against a wall to sign the agreement. By the Prime Minister's own admission, this is the biggest trade deal in Canadian history. To ask Canadians to discuss this in an intelligent way without having seen the deal is an absolutely remarkable request. It is an absurd process. Yet that is what we are expected to do and we are expected to take this whole thing seriously.

I ask my colleagues opposite, and I ask the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister responsible for wheat and oilseeds, do we really believe that we can have an intelligent conversation, an intelligent set of hearings, talking to experts