

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Mr. Boudria: The Minister will claim they are all mere coincidences.

Mr. Charest: What about the openings?

Mr. Boudria: This is all coincidence that they are shutting down and moving to the U.S. in preparation for free trade. Mere coincidence, say the Tories.

Mr. Charest: Point of order. I wonder if the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, in the name of logic, if he is going to attribute loss of jobs to the FTA, would also attribute to the FTA all the jobs created since November 21?

The Chairman: The Chair thinks that is a matter of debate.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I am looking forward to the Minister's speech so we can interrupt him as frequently as possible. I hope my colleagues will give him the kind of reciprocal treatment he so richly deserves.

I want to talk about the Prime Minister's trade deal and its effect on Canadian farmers. As my distinguished colleague just pointed out very astutely, it will have disastrous effects on Canadian agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Nonsense!

Mr. Boudria: The Tories say "nonsense".

Mr. Andre: It is going to cause drought and plague.

Mr. Boudria: We know the deal is bad for Canadian agriculture. Members across the way are saying there is nothing wrong with the deal. I say to them: If there is nothing wrong with the deal, then why on July 30, 1988, did the Canadian Federation of Agriculture send a letter to all Hon. Members saying that they have grave reservations about Bill C-130? Why did they say they want to see it amended before it is passed in the House? They rejected it in its present form. That Bill was identical to the one moved earlier last week, Bill C-2. This letter dated July 30 was sent to us by the National Council of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. I say to Members across the way: If the deal is so good for agriculture, why is it that an umbrella organization representing most if not all of the agricultural producers in Canada is against the deal?

Mr. McDermid: They are not.

Mr. Charest: Why did the farmers vote for us?

Mr. Boudria: The Minister asks why the farmers voted for the Government. I cannot complain personally about the vote of farmers in my riding because I was elected with 74 per cent of the vote. I think I have a mandate to speak on their behalf. The Conservatives say that under this deal we have guaranteed access to U.S. markets.

• (2030)

Mr. Charest: No, it was not.

Mr. Boudria: Oh, yes, it was said in the House in speeches yesterday. It has been said repeatedly in the House of Commons that we have this guaranteed access to the U.S. markets and that from now on things are going to be great.

Mr. Charest: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. In the name of accuracy I think that it would only be fair, if the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is making allegations about things that were apparently said by some Members on this side of the House, that he cite what was said. I challenge him now right here to get up to cite my words. I would like him to read me my words which I allegedly said in this House or elsewhere.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to abuse the rules of the House. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that Members should not be rising in their places pretending to raise points of order. I say to the Minister that if he cannot play within the rules of this place, why does he not go outside and talk to someone, if anyone is willing to listen to the stupidities he has to say?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Boudria: I was quoting a document—or I was attempting to—when his arrogance interrupted me. I want to say to the Minister—actually, I want to say this to other Members because they can probably understand it while he cannot.

The statement of administrative action of the President of the United States which was tabled with the United States Congress states under Article 1902 that each party retains the right to apply its national anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws to goods of the other party, and also reserves the right to amend those laws. The rights of amendment to the anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws with respect to goods of the other party is subject to requirements to notify, consult and so on. In other words, not only can the United States still apply countervailing duties, and any other