unfair? He said, no, that was the one thing about which we had no complaint. It was totally impartial. So that was the genius of that great negotiating team which should be heralded as the biggest bag of wind in the history of Canada. The chief negotiator has more gas exploding from him than the Hindenburg dirigible, and is about as reliable. The fact is that what was negotiated was an appeal procedure, not an exemption from the law, and in doing so, they have closed off other avenues that the Canadian industry could use.

Clearly, if the binational panel is chosen we cannot go to GATT. At least in the GATT we could challenge the law, we could challenge the premise of the law, but these geniuses have now closed that option. Furthermore, they have substantially altered the process of judicial review and the rights of using courts. To add insult to injury, to take that Mickey Mouse mechanism and put a Donald Duck character to it, after we got the final agreement, what did they do to the appeal procedure? They put another appeal procedure on top of it. We now have an appeal procedure to the appeal procedure.

If one looks at the criteria set out in this final agreement, one can see that any smart Washington lawyer worth his thousand dollar a day fee is going to find enough room to run a truck through. So we will end up with a process that takes longer than the one we have now. It will be more expensive and more time consuming, and that is the so-called benefit of the deal. The great accomplishment of this Government is to end up with an appeal procedure to an appeal procedure, lengthier time, costing more money to Canadian industry and no protection, no security of access. That is the bottom line of this agreement. So much for the benefits of this deal that the Minister promised.

Before I forget, let us talk about the so-called consumer benefits. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andre), a few days after, rushed out to the TV cameras with press releases saying that consumers will benefit extraordinarily. There was the Minister for International Trade promising people that they could run down to Fargo, North Dakota, or Spokane, Washington, and come back with their arms full of VCRs, cameras and television sets. There was this image in the minds of people of this long train of people in front of a cornucopia of goods being hauled out of various K-Marts on the border stations across Canada.

But the Consumers' Association says it is not such a hot deal. If we really look at the 10-year phase-in, it may mean we get a $50 or $60 saving a year, if we are lucky. Furthermore, most of the goods people are being promised are excluded because they have foreign components and under the rules of origin, if the VCR is made in Japan, Taiwan or Korea it is going to have the same tariff applied to it. We now have the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. MacKay) saying that, of course, we are going to keep our currency control, so the rule that says we can only bring in $50 worth of goods in the first 24 hours and $100 worth after will still be there. So much for the cornucopia.

Once again, we have this bloated, blown-up, bombastic propaganda being put forward by the Government, but when we look at the reality, what do we see? The problem is that the Government's propaganda machine has been characterized in the image of the Government itself. We have already had the shotgun wedding. That is what happens when you have a shotgun wedding, you get a false pregnancy. There are too many deals in which promises were made which never materialized. All of the so-called benefits have serious doubts cast upon them.

• (1230)

It is also interesting that the benefits which do result, such as the lowering of tariffs in some areas, could have been achieved as they have been in the past through negotiations internationally or under the U.S. trade law in accordance with which they are prepared to negotiate tariffs alone. We could have negotiated some tariff reduction. It would cause no dramatic upheaval for Canadians to do that. Previous Liberal Governments have negotiated far more tariff reductions than are contained in this agreement, which demonstrates that we are not against that. However, we never did that at the price of surrendering the control and management of our own economy as does this deal.

That brings us to the question of the costs. The Minister for International Trade went out of her way to suggest that this was a cost-free agreement. She suggested that this would be a simple matter of easy, open, peaceful transition. In fact, things are quite different. It is impossible for any government to claim that things will remain the same in the energy sector. When you lose the right to set price and supply you have lost control of the resource. That is what is in this agreement.

Even more damning, the so-called guaranteed access for Canadian energy to the United States market is not in the agreement. I read the agreement very carefully and do not see the words "guaranteed access" anywhere in the text. What does remain, however, is the right of the U.S. regulatory agency in Washington to set all the rules.

I want to remind Members of the House of the statement made by the Small Explorers and Producers Association of Canada, one of the three major oil and gas associations in Canada. It said that it is against this deal because it is not reciprocal, it does not give equal treatment. It says that we have given up our controls through the National Energy Board but the Americans have retained theirs. Prices in energy will be set in Washington or by cartels of OPEC or multinationals. The Government has lost its right to provide any leverage against such a cartel. This is the Government that says there is no limitation on sovereignty.

I have talked to a number of lawyers to get an explanation of this agreement. Sections 408 and 409 were not in the original agreement. The agreement disallows anyone from setting an export tax, not only on energy, but on any good exported to the United States. Section 408 goes on to say that