

*Customs Tariff*

No one in this country, no Member of Parliament, is opposed to improved trade arrangements between Canada and the U.S. or any other country. In October we had a lot of publicity—

**Mr. Hawkes:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It has been a long-standing tradition of this House that debate at all times should be focused, but particularly so at report stage when we are considering amendments moved by the Party to which the Hon. Member belongs. I think it is incumbent upon us to speak to each of the amendments. Some of them are grouped for debate. We on this side are having a great deal of difficulty understanding that the Hon. Member is speaking to the amendments proposed by his Party.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I appreciate what the Hon. Member is saying. I know the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) will be coming to the point.

Now we have another point of order from the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy).

**Mr. Cassidy:** Mr. Speaker, we have eight or nine amendments in this particular grouping. They all encompass the principle, according to the amendments, that these important tariff and trade actions taken by the Government of Canada should be subject to parliamentary accountability, just as a number of other matters in the customs and tariffs are subjected to parliamentary accountability. However, as I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary will realize—

**Some Hon. Members:** Order!

**Mr. McDermid:** Order, Mike!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) realizes what the amendments are and I think he will be coming to the relevant point.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, the reason I am discussing, quite briefly and in a general way, the effects, as I see them, of this free trade agreement is that I will go from that to show how the agreement will actually have an adverse effect on various groups in Canada. It is for that reason that we are opposed to giving the Government the ability to change tariff schedules by Order in Council.

As I said, this agreement was signed on October 3 and we were assured repeatedly that it would only be a few days or a week or two before we saw the final text. It is now almost two months since the agreement was supposedly signed and there is still no text. Our partners, the Americans, have continued to bring up important issues on which they want amendments. According to reports we have heard in the last couple of days, they want to change the section on the Auto Pact. They want their shipping industry excluded from the provisions of this agreement. They are calling on Canada to change its procurement policies.

• (1200)

They say that both the federal Government and provincial Governments of Canada give provincial suppliers an important advantage over others, including American suppliers. The fact is that the American Government and 49 of the 50 American States do exactly the same thing. The Buy American Act provides that American companies will have an advantage over foreign companies when the American Government is making purchases. The American Government makes purchases of hundreds of billions of dollars. Every state in the United States gives an advantage to companies in its state over companies in other states when making purchases. If they do that, they will obviously create difficulties for Canadian companies which want to make sales to the American federal or state Governments. We do not hear our negotiators talking about that.

The *Montreal Gazette* today reported on the issue of agriculture. The Prime Minister the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise), and our chief negotiator Mr. Reisman, have been asked repeatedly what effect this agreement will have on our farmers. Mr. Reisman said that it will not have any effect because our agricultural marketing boards and our supply management system are not even mentioned.

Mr. Reisman is a very able, clever, knowledgeable, and aggressive negotiator. I will not say that when he made that statement he was lying because, first, it would be unparliamentary and, second, because I do not want to say anything here to which he cannot reply directly. However, I say here, as I will say outside the House, that when Mr. Reisman said that agricultural producers will not be affected because supply management and marketing boards are not mentioned—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member's time has expired.

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the Chair has wisely chosen to group several motions for debate. I wish to address the principles of these motions today. I hope to be able to address as many of the motions which are before us as possible.

They all reflect a continuation of the struggle which began between the people and the monarchy as long ago as 1215 when King John was forced by the Lords of the day, who acted on behalf of the people, to sign the Magna Carta, which gave the very basic right for which we are fighting today with these amendments, that being the basic right of the Parliament of the country to establish what the rules should be with regard to the collection of taxes, the collection of government funds.

Under this particular Bill, approximately \$2 billion worth of government revenues is at stake. The Government is proposing to do away with that revenue. Canada spends in the neighbourhood of \$110 billion to \$130 billion per year and has incurred a deficit in each year for the past three years in the neighbourhood of \$30 billion. We are, therefore, not in a position to be giving away \$2 billion worth of revenue.