if they double again in 1971 and again in 1972? Why shouldn't they? We apparently have neither the laws of Parliament nor the desire of parliamentarians to prevent just such an occurrence.

• (9:30 p.m.)

That outlines the position with regard to beef and the oceanic countries, New Zealand and Australia. What is the situation with regard to New Zealand and beef imports? In 1969 we imported 28.7 million pounds of beef from New Zealand. This year, with the third quarter complete and statistics for the fourth quarter not yet to hand, we have already exceeded the 1969 total. We are faced with a total of 30 million pounds of beef from New Zealand alone. This gives us some idea of the increase. In fact, last year 7 per cent of the beef consumed in Canada came from Australia or New Zealand. This year it is something in the order of 12 per cent.

I am not particularly objecting to the fact that Canadian producers must meet competition, but I should like to recall the words of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) when he told a recent meeting of the agricultural congress that Canadian agriculture was subsidized to a significantly less degree than that of any other country in the world, including New Zealand and Australia. As the article in the *Cattleman* said, we must become sharp traders; we must be able to bargain for the rights of our producers. One can readily understand that western Canada is anxious to divert part of its wheat production capacity into the beef industry. For our part we must allow it a market for the products which Canadian farmers and ranchers have decided to raise.

How does this relate to Bill S-4? To explain this perhaps I should read from the proceedings of the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce. As reported on page 7 of the committee proceedings for November 4, 1970, Mr. J. R. Roy, acting head of the commercial policy division of the Department of External Affairs had this to say when explaining Bill S-4:

This bill is required to put into effect the Canada-New Zealand trade protocol which amends the 1932 trade agreement between Canada and New Zealand. The trade protocol was signed on May 13, 1970, in Wellington by the Prime Minister and the Right Honourable Keith Holyoake, Prime Minister of New Zealand.

We thought our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was attending nightclubs over there, but now we find he signed some important trade agreements which may have repercussions across western Canada particularly. He apparently believes in the theory that all play and no work makes "Pet" a dull boy. Mr. Roy continued:

The protocol does not alter the basic framework governing the conduct of our bilateral trade with New Zealand. However, it does update the present agreement and provides for certain benefits of mutual advantage.

I draw attention to the words "mutual advantage". As I read these committee proceedings, I fail to see the advantage which Canada will derive from this agreement. Mr. Roy continued:

There is a new provision on anti-dumping which will allow Canada to fulfil its obligations under the international anti-dumping code. At the same time it provides for roughly equivalent treatment of Canadian goods by the New Zealand authorities.



*New Zealand Trade Agreement Act*

Apparently Canada will be able to apply anti-dumping regulations against products coming from New Zealand. Well over three-quarters of the products coming from New Zealand are in the form of meat, lamb and beef—mostly beef. We receive practically all our mutton from New Zealand and there is a fifty-fifty break as between New Zealand and Australia lamb. Can we apply an anti-dumping code against these entries at any time? I doubt it very much. The chairman of the committee asked a question and Mr. Roy replied as follows:

In order to set this matter straight we have requested and obtained a modification to the trade agreement with New Zealand.

Senator Molson then commented:

There is no explanation here of the articles to be amended. For example, article IV and article V of the agreement are deleted. Frequently when legislation is prepared the changes are shown. In this case there are blanks on the explanation side.

Provision of explanations is normally a standard procedure. The effect of changes made is explained on the explanation side of the page. Senator Molson is quite right; Bill S-4 contains no explanatory notes whatever. On the following page, article IV of the GATT arrangements is discussed. Earlier today, a member of the government told us how good GATT was to Canada. I shall not quote his remarks but I wish to draw attention to the following point. Bill S-4 gives the government of New Zealand an opportunity to apply anti-dumping regulations under the GATT agreement to manufactured goods entering that country from Canada. No explanation of the reason has been given in this House, and I fail to see that any explanation was provided during the Senate committee hearings. No assurance was given that similar action could be taken by Canada against commodities, manufactured or otherwise, entering this country from New Zealand.

I invite hon. members to consider the problems facing western Canada agriculture today. One sees a substantial increase in hog production all across western Canada, in the neighbourhood of 70 per cent in the province of Saskatchewan, 26 per cent in Alberta and 23 per cent in Manitoba. One might ask what effect this will have on the price of cattle. It has had a drastic effect on cattle prices, thus compounding the difficulties which Canadian cattlemen face already, quite apart from sharp increases in imports from Australia and New Zealand.

I invite hon. members to read the Washington Farmletter put out by a farm writer, Wayne Darrow. He has this to say about the price of pork in the United States. He writes that because pork prices have fallen so low they have caused a sharp decline in the price of cattle, amounting to 5 cents a pound. I read from the Washington Farmletter of January 8. Hon. members will see that these are current figures.

Not all the damage of the hog glut is reflected in hog price returns. Cattlemen got hurt, too. Choice steer prices at Omaha peaked at $31.48 cwt. the first week in July. Then, although volume of beef kill remained right at 1969 level, price fell to $26.09 in December. Both pork volume and economic sag had a hand in this $5 fall.