

*Customs Tariff*

laughing at the other end of the line. Indeed, I could hear the laughter all the way from Washington when this Government declared a counter attack that hurts Canadians more than it hurts Americans.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear: Canadians ought to know that this response, these reprisals are going to cost them a lot of money. About \$80 million will be paid by the Canadian consumer as a result of this tariff on books and computer parts and chips. This was made very clear by all representatives from the industry who appeared before the legislative committee that examined this Bill, and it was indeed said by those same representatives when the Government's decision was announced. They said that this decision would do Canadians a more harm than the Americans. Why? Because these goods, these computer parts and chips, are not manufactured in Canada. Canadian companies are obliged to order their supplies from the United States. They have no choice, since we have no major Canadian industry that would be able to fill these orders. These companies will be obliged to increase their costs and to transfer those costs to the consumer, and this, as I said earlier, is going to affect the competitive position of Canadian companies.

[English]

I suppose one has to ask why are we doing this. Why are we imposing a tariff on Canadian computer chips and parts, a measure which will cost Canadians and will cost Canadian jobs. The only answer I could come up with is that we are paying for the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) education, albeit an imperfect one at that. His reaction when the President of the United States imposed the tariff on cedar shakes and shingles was exceedingly strong if you remember, Mr. Speaker. It reminded me a bit of a lover's spat. I think it demonstrates what we have been saying all along, that the Government and the Prime Minister have entered into these negotiations under false pretenses. They have entered into the negotiations assuming that by cosying up to the President, by being friends with the President and by supporting the President's initiatives in foreign policy and in many other areas we would somehow get an advantage which would translate into a trade negotiation, a deal that would be to Canada's advantage.

Lately, however, we have seen the Prime Minister say that he is prepared to walk away from a bad deal. But he contradicts himself. He says that he is putting his job on the line, that the next election will be fought on trade. When the Prime Minister puts so much importance into one single issue, when he says that his future rests on it, that the future of his Government rests on it and that he is prepared to fight the next election on it, I challenge anyone in this House to tell me whether that language supports the PM's other statement that he is prepared to walk away from a bad deal. I say the two statements are totally contradictory, that the Prime Minister, because he is staking his whole credibility on this trade

negotiation, will be willing to do anything and to give up anything in order to arrive at a deal to salvage his credibility.

It is from contradictions of this nature, from an incoherent negotiating strategy, that we arrived at this decision which, as I have tried to explain, will hurt Canadians and will not help our negotiating position one iota. If this will help Canadians and our negotiating position, why did not even one Member of the Conservative Party either at second reading, in committee or at third reading stand up to defend this Bill? That does not make any sense, Mr. Speaker.

This measure confirms also what we have tried to say, time and time again on our side of the House, that trade is not enough, that it is no substitute for the appropriate policies in the area of education, training and research. I invite you, Sir, to have look at today's editorial cartoon in *The Citizen* here in Ottawa. The editorialist captures the problem far better than anyone else. The cartoon is headed:

"Canada Prepares For the Launch into Free Trade—"

The cartoon shows a Canadian under a crane with a whole series of weights being placed on his head burdening him down. The first weight entitled: "Reduced education spending". The second weight is entitled "Reduced scientific research", and the third weight which is being lowered onto the head of this unsuspecting member of the Canadian public is entitled "U.S. Book Tariff". We could add many other weights, including the weight about which I have been talking, the additional tariff on computer chips and parts. Of course this unsuspecting Canadian, a person who is supposed to represent all Canadians, is reading a piece of paper upside down which says "So long dummy". That is the way we are launching and preparing ourselves for free trade, by burdening Canadians with a series of weights that will only prevent us from competing in this global market.

• (1140)

In conclusion, if there is any lesson for Canadians to learn through the imposition of this tariff it is that it is not enough to defend ourselves against the U.S. Government, that we must defend ourselves against our own Government.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speake, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words on Bill C-111. This is a very important Bill, as you well know. It has the potential to do great and wonderful things, but I am afraid it fails to do them. One of our problems in this House is that we seem to name our Bills incorrectly. The title of Bill C-111 is "An Act to amend the Customs Tariff and to amend An Act to amend the Customs Tariff". That does not tell us very much. I think a more appropriate title would be "An Act that Gives the Impression that Canada is Helping the Caribbean Countries and an Act to Close Down Many Medium and Small Canadian Businesses doing Work in the Computer Chips and Computer Parts Industries". That would be a more descriptive title for the Bill and would outline what this Bill does.