

and answers provided in the House given us a full understanding of the deal. I think it is relatively clear that we have given away some of our sovereignty with this agreement by providing full investment freedom to the purchase of resource lands. It appears we have also done the same thing for farm and recreation lands. I simply pose a simple question at the end of my remarks; if giving away control over who invests in these fundamental lands which make up our country is not giving away sovereignty, what is?

Mr. Wise: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the spokesperson for the New Democratic Party on agricultural policy. It behooves me to say that 50 per cent of farm income comes from export sales. If we exclude grains and oilseeds from those sales, we find that two-thirds, or roughly 60 per cent of agricultural commodities which we produce here in Canada is sold into the export market, but sold exclusively into the export market.

If we think about that for a moment, we must ask how in the world the Hon. Member can stand in his place and say this is not a good deal for Canadian agriculture? I really do not know who he speaks for. I think we should be referring to the industry spokespeople. They are not ministers of agriculture. They are not opposition critics. These are people who have made their living day after day in the agricultural industry. The spokesperson for the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, a big industry in Canada, is supportive of the U.S.-Canada bilateral trade arrangement. The spokesperson for the pork industry says it is supportive of the Canada-U.S. trade arrangement. The spokesperson for the dairy industry of Canada is supportive of the Canada-U.S. trade arrangement.

The spokesperson for the Canadian Chicken Marketing Agency, and he should be very familiar to my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, is very supportive as well. The spokesperson for the Canadian Broiler Hatching Egg Marketing Agency is very supportive. The spokesperson for the Canadian Horticultural Council, speaking on behalf of that industry, is very supportive as well. The list goes on.

I sat here and listened to the spokesperson from the New Democratic Party say this is not a good agreement for Canadian agriculture when in fact, if we look at what the spokespeople for the industry itself are saying, the industry is taking a very positive position. So I simply ask the Hon. Member who in the world he is speaking for?

Mr. Althouse: Madam Speaker, I speak for the farmers in my riding. I speak for the farmers across the country.

Mr. Gormley: You haven't gone back to your riding for years. What a joke.

Mr. Althouse: I was there last Thursday, Friday and Saturday, Sir.

An Hon. Member: And it was three years before that.

Supply

Mr. Althouse: And many times before. I am just giving the most recent. The Hon. Member says three years.

Mr. Broadbent: He was here before you were, and he will be here after you are gone, fellow.

Mr. Mayer: There is another farmer, the hon. farmer from Oshawa.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Order. This debate having just started, I am sure all Hon. Members will have a chance to put forward their opinion. The Hon. Member for Humboldt—Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) has the floor.

Mr. Althouse: I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) will know and agree that there are flaws in this agreement, that it does in fact encourage the export of products rather than the home processing of products.

● (1140)

I said in my speech that it does not change greatly the relations between our two countries with regard to red meat. We did not really need to state anything in this agreement with regard to red meat. We have had access to each other's markets for a long time. It has occasionally been interrupted by individual states, and this agreement does nothing about that. It has occasionally been disrupted by so-called health considerations, and this agreement does not really attempt to do anything about that. In fact, it recognizes that there will be occasions when our health requirements, on either side of the border, will affect trade.

I will admit, and I may not have mentioned it in my speech, that it has changed the tariffs between our two countries with regard to live cattle. It has taken that last one cent which was no real impediment to trade in any case on a \$1.50 feeder calf—another cent does not make much difference. So that section of it was simply a regurgitation of what had been in the agreement before.

But the sections dealing with those products that are produced in Canada under supply management have created a field-day for American imports.

Mr. Mayer: He does not understand the agreement.

Mr. Althouse: The import licences have been increased, as I read the agreement. It has been agreed that the import licences will be increased.

Mr. Mayer: They are maintained at exactly the same level as they were over the last five years.

Mr. Althouse: As I understand the process of those import licences, the incentive will be for the processors and wholesalers who now hold those import licences to bring in the most highly processed product they can. It is now conducted on the basis of pounds. If one brings in a TV dinner that is all set to go which might retail for \$2.95 or something like that, then one is making the best use of one's import licence. It will not