

*Free Trade*

mechanism for the safeguards protecting Canadians percentage production, employment and content disappear.

What about agriculture? Agriculture was not supposed to be in the deal. If we read the preamble, it is clearly in the deal. If we read the whole agricultural section, it is in the deal. The family farm will be devastated.

*[Translation]*

We find in the Agreement, in the document itself, that there will be a progressive elimination of the protection afforded by seasonal duties. We find in the final text of the Agreement that our farmers will be unable to face American competition because, while this document uses the term "free trade", Canadian farmers will never be able to compete because of our difficult climate and short four, five or six-month season. They will never be able to face totally free competition with American farmers, especially those in California, Florida and Georgia, who have a twelve-month season. It is impossible. If we want to remain self-sufficient in agriculture, we should never sign such an agreement because it will destroy the family farm in Canada.

The Prime Minister spoke this morning about GATT Article 11. This was an afterthought in the negotiations following the interventions of the Quebec Minister of Agriculture.

I must tell Quebec farmers that the problem has not been solved. The agreement is contradictory, as the UPA has already concluded. The UPA has told the newspapers that there is a contradiction between articles 703 and 710 of the Agreement. Article 710 states that import barriers will be reduced, while article 70 states that protection will be maintained, and this raises very important questions. There is an obvious and even glaring contradiction between those articles which brings into question the whole application of GATT Article 11. Will it be necessary to phase out all existing marketing boards? Will it be possible to create new ones? I seriously doubt it!

*[English]*

Our whole supply management system is being negotiated away. If we allow the import restrictions on major grains, if we allow the import restrictions seasonally on fruit and vegetables, if we allow the whole range of horticulture to disappear, there is no way that supply management can be contained in this country. Canadian agricultural programs will be—to use the delightful word of this agreement—"harmonized". They will be harmonized with U.S. programs. Harmonization is defined in Article 711 of the agricultural section of the agreement. It means making identical.

What has happened here is that every support program for western grain producers is listed in the agreement along with the list of support programs for U.S. farmers. Those two lists will now be made identical.

Our list includes the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, PFRA; it includes the Agricultural and Rural Development

Act, ARDA; it includes the Economic and Rural Development Agreements, the ERDA agreements; it includes the Agricultural Stabilization Act, the Western Grain Stabilization Act, the Special Canadian Grains Program, the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, and Crop Insurance Program. All those programs and others listed fully in the agreement, probably taking it out of the ambit of Article 11 of GATT, will be harmonized with U.S. programs.

Since the United States overwhelmingly dominates in agriculture by virtue of its size and market, the level of government support for Canadian farmers will be determined not by Ottawa, not by provincial capitals, but by Washington.

*[Translation]*

Mr. Speaker, a new section added to the legal text states that, if the federal or provincial Governments wish to designate a monopoly by creating a Crown corporation at either the federal or the provincial level, or by using another system or method in a given sector, for whatever reasons, they will first have to obtain the authorization of the American Government. They will then have to ensure that no monopoly will grant preference to Canadian goods and services. The type of arrangement which exists between Bell Canada and Northern Telecom, for instance, could become unacceptable under this provision. There will also be an impact on existing and future utilities, such as electricity and hydro, and provincial programs such as automobile insurance and provincial health care plans. Articles 103 and 502 of the agreement also state that the federal Government will ensure compliance by the provinces and municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I can predict with some certainty that the provincial Governments will have much to say about the specific impact of this agreement on their jurisdiction in these areas.

*[English]*

The very premise of this agreement is based on free market forces. There is clause after clause and article after article that insists on harmonization and the free flow of those forces. That is relevant to this country in three ways that strike me immediately.

First, this country would never have been built east, west and north without some resistance to those continental economic forces. For 120 years we have resisted those forces and created a nation. Yet this agreement turns those forces north and south. Second, on the basis of pure economic forces and market forces, we would not have achieved some measure of economic equality in Canada. We would not have had a basis for our regional economic equality programs. We would not have had the basis for a philosophy that wherever one is born in the country, wherever one chooses to live when one comes to the country, or wherever one receives an education, one will have the same rights as a Canadian to a good education, a good job, and a secure retirement. Market forces would never have given us that.