

Supply

only anchorman they had in Quebec and already their lack of knowledge about the Quebec situation is readily apparent.

An Hon. Member: It shows already!

Mr. Blais: It shows already, we can already see how far behind they are with respect to their awareness of Quebec agricultural problems. There is precious little the NDP can teach me about Quebec's agricultural community. Earlier this morning, Madam Speaker, I attended a regional UPA meeting in Beauce where I met six or so groups from every corner of the province, local agricultural producers right where they live.

An Hon. Member: Jacques Proulx!

Mr. Blais: Yes, I met Mr. Jacques Proulx as well.

An Hon. Member: What did he say?

Mr. Blais: It is quite obvious that when my colleague brings up the name of the President of the Union *des producteurs agricoles* or refers to the coalition against free trade with Mrs. Shirley Carr, with the Canadian Auto Workers, of course you are speaking for all of them. I listened very attentively to my colleague. One thing for sure is that I saw—you demonstrated this yesterday—how you let people have their say in your own Party. But I am not in your Party. When I have the floor, let me speak.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I would appreciate it if the Minister were to direct his remarks to the Chair, not to his colleagues in the House. Had the Minister concluded his remarks?

The Minister has the floor.

Mr. Blais: Madam Speaker, I am not used to having people speak at the same time as I do. That is why. I apologize.

As to the question of access to the American market raised a moment ago by my colleague, I would suggest that the positive step we took when signing the agreement shows indeed that we are going to reverse the protectionist process which was gaining ground as weeks and months went by. As I see it, it was a question of principle to convince our neighbours to say: This trench warfare in various sectors has to stop. I think access is guaranteed under the agreement. That is intrinsic, that transpires from the agreement, Madam Speaker.

And whenever he speaks about the pork industry, he forgets to say that the Canadian Pork Council agrees with this Agreement, Madam Speaker, and I do not see why, in those conditions, the issue is being raised. As regards any possible further countervail action, I fail to understand why that party keeps on claiming that that agreement jeopardizes our sovereignty, and at the same time, as soon as there is some evidence that either country can preserve its sovereignty and the ability to act through its existing laws and regulations, some people say: You did nothing, and now you don't solve the problem. Both countries have preserved their sovereignty, Madam Speaker. This is one fundamental issue. We succeeded

in making a progressive deal for both parties, while preserving national sovereignty on both sides of the border. Together in the same direction, that is a good way of describing that deal, Madam Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Debate. Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria).

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today in this debate on the free trade Agreement and its possible impact on Canadian agriculture. As you know, our colleagues in this House have introduced today that non-confidence motion, whereby they claim that the free trade Agreement will first lead to the elimination of our two-price system for wheat and, second, undermine the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board, reduce the growth of supply management marketing boards, as well as the growth opportunities for Canadian fruit and vegetable producers.

Madam Speaker, I have looked at this motion with great interest and I must say that I agree with most of the issues that it raises. I was recently reading an article in a newspaper which said that this free trade deal was going to put Canadian agriculture through the meat grinder. I think this term best describes how my constituents feel about this deal. I know the Minister intends to visit my constituency shortly and that we will both participate in a debate on free trade. At least, this is the information I have. The Minister will probably indicate his support for the deal and, as you surely have guessed, Madam Speaker, I intend to say to my constituents—and they already know it—that this deal is bad for Canadian agriculture.

The Minister said earlier that many vegetable growers were happy with the free trade deal. This is strange because members of the Liberal caucus met last week with representatives of the Canadian Horticultural Council who told us that their industry would suffer a lot from this deal. Where then does the Minister get his information? I do not know, Madam Speaker. The Quebec Union des Producteurs Agricoles said recently that agriculture was sacrificed in this deal between Canada and the U.S.

Madam Speaker, why does the Government of Canada want Canadian agriculture to be similar to American agriculture? Must we have the same systems? I do not think so. Madam Speaker, 1.5 millions U.S. farmers are going bankrupt. Is that what we want for our farmers? Canadian agriculture has enough problems as it is and we should all work together to improve the lot of our producers instead of trying to put them in a situation similar to that of American farmers.

The Minister says that we are being partisan. Madam Speaker, you know better. You know that I never show any partisanship in this House, and I do not intend to change my ways today or in the coming days. However, this is an issue where all Canadians have a right to be partisan and all Members have a right to voice the hopes and aspirations of