

Supply

The Dunkel report then affects some elements that could really put Quebec in a tight spot, and I will give you examples. It provides sanctions for equity investment such as the Société générale de financement, the Caisse de dépôt et de placement, the Société de développement industriel, Soquip, and so on, have. That means that the action taken by our provincial government can be subject to sanctions. I know that the federal government talks about theoretical sanctions. I remember that the last time we heard about "theoretical sanctions" was during the free trade negotiations. Unfortunately these theoretical sanctions became real sanctions—talk to the people at Norsk Hydro or to the people in British Columbia about softwood lumber.

The loan guarantee programs in Quebec, which are another form of intervention often used in our province, can also be subject to sanctions. Sanctions might also be taken against tax incentives and tax credits in Quebec, according to the Dunkel report. I am sure that the minister of consumer affairs is aware that this includes the stock savings plan as well as flowthrough shares, the occupational training tax credit and even the tax credit used to launch the solidarity fund.

I speak of these programs as activities that can be denounced and subject to sanctions in the Dunkel report because they are called specific subsidies. When they are specific, they can be denounced by any other country that signed the agreement. Unfortunately this could be disastrous for Quebec, not only because Quebec is different in that we have a variety of programs to support our agricultural industry, and also for consumers because if all these sanctions are applied, with free trade, foreign companies and the whole foreign agriculture industry will surely find the field quite open for unfair but legal competition.

• (1700)

Mr. Speaker, my colleague's motion is extremely important and I think it is quite clear, unlike the government's negotiations at GATT. We are very clear in our motion, which reads as follows: "That this House calls on the government to support unequivocally any final GATT accord that—" and this is very simple, since it does at least two things— "provides for the mainte-

nance of viable and effective management programs as an essential element of Canadian agricultural policy". Second, Mr. Speaker, we ask the government to support unequivocally any final GATT accord that: "ensures the ability of Canada, through a clarified article XI, to control effectively imports of milk, eggs, hatching eggs, chicken and turkey, and products containing a majority of supply managed products".

Mr. Speaker, I agree that Quebec's farm sector is not the only one affected by these problems. They affect Canada as a whole, including city dwellers as customers, and people in rural areas as producers. As a consumer advocate, I have tried in recent weeks to find out whether our production system makes food and food products more expensive than they would be in the United States. I have often heard people say this, but today, a Nova Scotia poultry producer told me that in 1982, they got \$1.16 for every chicken; 10 years later, in 1992, they are still getting \$1.16 for every chicken.

I do not think we are paying too much for our food, but I wonder whether food is cheaper in the United States. Of course it is cheaper. However, I left the United States because I did not want to belong to a society where the individual does not count, and where the traditional farm does not count, where instead people are intent on vertical integration, big business, so-called agribusiness. Mr. Speaker, after giving up the United States to come to Canada and become a Canadian citizen, I would hate to become, oh, irony of ironies, an American living in Canada, after all those 23 years. This is just too much

I have a stake in this debate because I experienced what is happening to the United States, and I experienced what is happening to Canada, and frankly, there is no point in living like Americans and having the kind of businesses Americans have. We have something better here. Perhaps members on the other side of the House do not accept this because it isn't enough. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that we have a standard of living, social security, medicare and all kinds of programs that make our country different from the United States. I think that one of the reasons why the current GATT talks have caused so much dissatisfaction and even outrage across Canada is that Canadians realize they are about to lose what they had gained.