

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

create jobs, not just for the Canadians who are here but for the Canadians who should be encouraged to come here in the future. Canada should have as its century the 21st century because we present a different kind of model from that of our neighbour to the south.

There are those who argue that somehow Ontario is trying to resist the opportunities that would lie in the future for the West and the East in this free trade deal. In 10 minutes I will not be left with very much time to examine an issue of this sort in great detail. I would ask those in Alberta and Saskatchewan whether they have seen that North and South Dakota and Wyoming have become the industrial giants that the Conservative Government says that they will be. I ask those in the Maritimes whether they really think that becoming more like Maine will make them more prosperous. Will the fate of this country and the fate of those regions reside where so many Canadians have told us over and over again? They want control of their economic future in their hands. They do not want an ACOA that is controlled from Ottawa, nor do they want an economy that is controlled from New York or Washington. They want the opportunity to shape their own fate.

If there is an alternative to the free trade deal, certainly it must be admitted that that future will not be gained without struggle, without sacrifice. The struggle and the sacrifice is to ensure the future of a country that has so much to offer.

We have said repeatedly that we must allow those in the regions to control their own regional economical development by decision making at the local level. We must make it possible for every community to shape its future through the financial resources and the expertise necessary, but we must recognize that this country is going to be competing in a knowledge based world economy. The Government is selling this country down the river if it truly believes that it can achieve the kind of innovation and the production of new products that this country will need if it intends to compete in the future. We are robbing our children of their future.

There are who say there will be job losses in the textile industry and in the service industry over the short term, but the real sacrifice will be the loss to Canada of the opportunities that this land offers us and the opportunities to shape a new model for the world about what a country can do if it pursues not just prosperity but social justice.

I do not want the cities of Canada to look like Detroit, New York, or Chicago with a market oriented philosophy, allowing the kind of degradation that that kind of market-driven philosophy which the Reagans and the Thatchers have allowed. Let us retain our independence. I stand with the majority of Canadians who are firmly against this deal, and in the future will be a majority of Canadians as demonstrated in an election. I dare those people over there to do two things: Read the agreement and then go talk about it to the electorate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2130)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take a few minutes to speak to Bill C-130, which deals with the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. Ten minutes are of course hardly enough to address all the aspects of a Bill that contains so many pages and schedules and so forth. I will therefore concentrate on two issues that are of particular concern to me: agriculture and energy. Within these two sectors, I would like to deal with some very specific questions, namely marketing boards for agricultural products, including supply management, and our food processing industries which are located across Canada, including a number in the province I represent, the province of Quebec.

Madam Speaker, the Government has been saying that the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement does not in any way affect Canada's supply management policy, what we call supply management marketing boards. Government Members maintain that article 710 of the agreement allows both governments to set up marketing boards and to maintain existing ones. They maintain that this is consistent with our obligations under GATT, where article XI allows the creation of such boards.

However, it is extremely difficult to reconcile article 710 of the agreement with other articles in the same agreement, for instance article 703, which invites the parties, Canada and the United States, to improve access to their respective markets by eliminating tariff barriers and other barriers to imports. Furthermore, section 3 of the Bill provides that the purpose of this legislation is "to eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States". And this is followed by a whole series of objectives.

So how do you reconcile Article 710, which seems to allow some marketing boards, with the restrictions of Article 703 and clause 3 of the Bill, which seek to eliminate these tariff and non-tariff barriers?

Since, as we saw in the debates in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate, the United States considers marketing boards to be barriers limiting the imports of American products into Canada, we are entitled to wonder whether we can set up such boards or after the process of harmonization, whether existing marketing boards can resist the pressure from the Americans, who will certainly use Article 703 of the agreement and Section 3 of the Canadian legislation to try to eliminate these barriers that marketing boards and supply management are in their view. Personally, I believe that as it is written, the agreement that was signed, as well as Bill C-130 that is being considered, will limit Canada's ability to set up marketing boards and to control supply. And this seems to fit in—this concern is found in the articles I mentioned and it is consistent with the spirit in which the Bill and the agreement seem to have been written, in particular the interpretation given by American legislators to these articles I just mentioned.