

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member for South Shore with great interest. He seemed to be saying that the NAFTA was a great step forward in helping the supply management sector, helping trade and so on.

I wonder if the hon. member could explain exactly why the government failed to get a subsidy code and an anti-dumping code the free trade deal when it was renegotiating under NAFTA. Taking into account all the problems we have had with the steel industry, with the hog and pork industry, all the trade dispute problems that the Prime Minister said would be solved by the FTA, it did not make arrangements to have a subsidy code so there would not be any future countervail duties against Canadian products being sold to the United States? Why did we not make arrangements for a countervail duty code so that everybody would know? Since every other free trade deal in the world, whether it is the European Economic Community group or the Australasian group or the New Zealand–Australia free trade deal, has these arrangements why did this government not—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. There is one minute remaining in the comments or questions period.

**Mr. McCreath:** Mr. Speaker, I could hardly do justice to such a complex question in one minute but I will try the best I can.

The important thing is that we do have a dispute settlement mechanism, in fact we have two of them in a general way in chapter eighteen and more specifically in chapter nineteen, which is definitive and inclusive.

As for the subsidy definition issue obviously it would be desirable to sort it out but the two parties have not been able to come to an agreement. What is important about the FTA and about NAFTA is what we have come to an agreement on.

My hon. friend talks about agriculture. I remind him again that the supply managed sector in Canada is fully protected under the FTA and again under NAFTA. If he thinks it is such a bad deal for farmers then he should talk to the pork producers. He should hear what they think about the FTA and the mechanism for resolving disputes which have served Canadians so well and so effectively and which we would not have without the FTA.

### *Supply*

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** I am happy to have an opportunity to participate in this debate. The motion put forward by my colleague from York North was:

That this House condemn the government for its policies that have stifled economic growth, destroyed Canadian jobs and exacerbated the recession.

My colleague left out one very important point in his motion when he talked about destroying Canadian jobs. There is one sector of the economy of this country that has grown, and that is the lobbyist sector. Under this government the lobbyists have managed successfully to influence and assist in this government's policy in a most destructive way for the past seven or eight years. I do not think Canadians today realize just what a force the lobbyist industry has been on this government.

Another area that has grown under this government is the area of the underground cash economy. There are experts today who would suggest that the underground economy in this country is worth over \$100 billion.

• (1550)

There is a professor at the University of British Columbia, W.E. Diewert, who said that before the GST the underground economy was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$80 billion and since the GST it has been exacerbated and is now in excess of \$100 billion.

When this government stands up today to defend its record I wonder what planet it will be on. When we go home to our ridings on the weekends or during breaks we run into people day in and day out who are without jobs, young people who are just graduating and cannot even get interviews because there is not even an opportunity. We talk about small businesses that are hanging on by their fingernails, and the government stands today and quotes its record and its statistics.

During the next election the central issue in the campaign is going to be one of trust. Government members are going to be one of trust. Government members are going to be saying "Trust us to stay the course". I cannot believe that the people of Canada will accept that, and it will not matter who the new leader is. It will not matter if it is the minister for small businesses, the Minister of National Defence or the member for Cambridge. The bottom line is they are going to run on their record of the last nine years.