

it. Look at the president of Alcan. I am not at all worried for him. He was able to arrange some cozy deals for himself. The Prime Minister and his Ministers were not embarrassed at all to rise and tell us that the Bill on pharmaceutical products had nothing to do with free trade.

A few days later, however, we discovered the document initialed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) which included a paragraph on that very issue. Naturally, they did not remember what they had signed. It has been lies from the beginning.

Canadians are therefore entitled to ask certain questions. They are entitled to wonder whether their future is being compromised by a gang of amateurs, and I fear that is the case, Mr. Speaker.

As for the Americans, they have looked at all this, and from their reaction, they seem to think that they are the big winners in this deal. They are saying: "We have fooled them. In any case, the Canadian Government was determined to succeed and we had them where we wanted." They certainly had, and they obtained everything that they wanted.

The Prime Minister told us that there were two essential conditions, guaranteed access and a binding settlement mechanism. At our very great surprise and disappointment, in spite of all these nice speeches, at this very moment, all the American protectionist measures still apply to Canadian products. The protection measures provided in Section 201 of the 1974 Trade Act still apply. The anti-dumping measures still apply. The compensatory rates provided in the 1930 Tariff Act still apply. The trade reprisals still apply. We were supposed to have a special status. We had been told not to worry, that there would no longer be any problem with a free trade agreement. All the problems are still there. As recently as today, another Bill was tabled in the American Congress, this time to restrict electricity imports. I am certain that this must also be in the spirit of free trade. What is even worse, the famous tribunal will not be a real tribunal. Its only power will be to interpret the application of American and Canadian laws, but not to judge whether they are appropriate or not. The situation will remain exactly as before.

At the very moment I am speaking . . . Often did I ask questions on behalf of wood producers in my riding who were concerned about the 15 per cent tax on softwood lumber, and I was told: Wait until the free trade agreement comes out. But they had no reason to wait, for the 15 per cent tax is now a permanent feature of the free trade accord. And they call this solving the problem.

As for hog producers, they were told to wait for the free trade agreement. The accord has now been signed, but the \$10 a head surtax still applies. What have you settled?

**An Hon. Member:** Tell him about the footwear industry. We will get out clothes from Taiwan.

### Supply

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, she is yelling that apple producers do agree. For sure she is raving, since we export hardly any.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you one thing. This panel will change nothing in the daily application of the American protectionist legislation. Economists like Marie-Josée Drouin, from the C.D. Howe Institute, say that this panel is actually nothing at all. People realize everywhere that setting-up the binational panel is really creating serious problems for us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at some of our industries. Let us consider the case of farmers. Last week-end, I visited the Agricultural Fair where I had an opportunity to meet a UPA delegation, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) had a long conversation with them and was made aware of their concerns, Mr. Speaker. We could easily understand their situation. People of Portneuf, can you imagine, instead of relying on the instinct and experience of farmers, the Hon. Member for Portneuf (Mr. Ferland) would rather trust a Montreal newspaperman who probably has never milked a cow in his whole life.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more confidence in the common sense of our farmers who can see the dangers involved. I have more confidence in Quebec producers who say they stand to lose a large share of the poultry market. When Quebec producers tell me dairy farmers will be at risk, I have a lot more confidence in them than in a bunch of Conservative ninnies. I have a lot more confidence in the membership of Agropur, Mr. Speaker, when they explain that their survival depends on being able to produce yogurt and processed cheese, than in that bunch of ignoramuses. They would have us depend on U.S. producers—for shame!

• (1650)

Mr. Speaker, I think the Conservative Members who represent rural ridings are pathetic. They should listen to their farmers. Those people in the UPA, Mr. Speaker are defending their own interests, but their interests happen to be our market basket. When a country ends up depending on another country for all its food—I don't want Canada to be another Lesotho, surrounded by South Africa. Mr. Speaker, they tell us: Don't worry, the farmers will be able to compete. Mr. Speaker, have you ever seen people with a three-month growing season for market gardening able to compete with U.S. producers in the South and Southwest who produce crops twelve months of the year? Mr. Speaker, it does not take a Grade 12 certificate to know that we have a cold climate here in Canada, and that we cannot compete because of what the energy costs would be in certain sectors. Mr. Speaker, it costs more to raise pigs in Canada. After all, we have to heat during winter. The way the Canadian Government is treating Canadian producers, however, they are starting to think what they are going to do with all those pig and chicken farms. Mr. Speaker, there won't be any left in the long run. I hope Conservative Members will wake up before it is too late. Mr. Speaker, look at the headlines in *Le Devoir*: Free trade may mean end of agricultural