

Supply

I talked to the potato producers in Manitoba. They know full well that it is their marketing system that is under attack. I suggest that we are seeing duplicity in this House. Every time the Minister of Finance or the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) says that the supply management system has not been touched, I suggest that they do not know much about supply management. One of the essential ingredients is the use of tariffs to ensure that cheaper goods cannot be imported to undermine the supply of that product. It is nonsense for Members of the Government to say that supply management or marketing boards will not be touched. If they knew anything about it, they would at least admit that. They should at least have the honesty of their convictions, rather than trying to hide behind the foolish nonsense we hear every day.

Let us consider another so-called commitment the Government has made. The Government says that it will not touch regional development and that it is not in the agreement. Indeed, it is in the agreement in some very substantial ways.

As I said at the outset, the only thing that was not touched by this agreement was preventing the United States from taking countervail actions against Canadian goods, services or products. Let me refer to a recent decision by the ITC, to see what it considers is countervailable. According to this agreement, that so-called binational panel must take into account American precedents and American law. Let me read the American law and American precedents in the ITC decision, 1986. What is countervailable? Investment tax credits to industries, programs for export market development, regional development incentive programs, industrial and regional development programs, community-based industrial adjustment programs, agricultural rural development agreements, general development agreements and economic regional development agreements are all countervailable. All those regional programs that we have used in Canada to try to ensure a fair sharing of goods and services in this country are now subject to trade law and are being entrenched in this agreement.

It is no wonder that the Deputy Minister of Finance, who I presume advises his Minister from time to time, said to a committee that in fact we will have to do regional development very differently because this agreement no longer allows for those kinds of grants to Michelin or other companies as was possible under IRDA agreements or general development agreements.

Who is the Government trying to fool? What is its real agenda? Canadians know that this is simply a cosmetic agreement to cover up something else. I believe the cover-up is part of the Government's ideology, shared by the Reagan Administration, that they do not believe there should be regional development programs like these. They do not believe that there should be freight rates or that Governments can be used in a constructive, positive way to apply goals and standards for a market economy. They do not believe in a political economy, but have idolized the market economy.

They believe that a market economy will make the proper allocation of programs.

I suggest that the Government talk to the starving people in the inner cities of Canada and the people in the hinterlands of Canada who are without jobs because their research programs and regional development programs are being cut back. They know that they require government participation.

The most important fact to remember is that this country has been built into a distinctive society because we have been able to use Government in an effective way, by building proper transportation systems, communications systems and regional development programs.

Successive generations of Canadians and their Governments have known that one of the reasons that we have been able to stay on this northern part of the continent and establish our own identity and do things our way is that we have the power and ability to make our own decisions. The Government is abdicating the rights of Canadians to make those decisions. It is beginning to put a fence around our political institutions and slowly eviscerate the capacity of Canadians to decide for themselves who and what they want to be.

The point is that it was not necessary because there have been alternatives. Every Member of the House knows that in the past we have succeeded in opening trade around the world through international trade rules that limit the power of big nations. That is why 80 per cent of our goods now go to the United States tariff-free.

The most ironic statement of all was made by the Minister for International Trade this morning when she said: "We want Canada to be world traders". In the last three years our trade with the Pacific Rim declined 25 per cent. Our trade with the Middle East has gone down 20 per cent. The Government has cut back export development programs, other than to the United States. It has closed embassies and trade offices.

In other words, our trade with the rest of the world has shrunk under the Tory Government. It is far less than it was three years ago because the Government does not want to trade with the rest of the world. It wants to lock itself into a North American fortress, run by the ideological right wingers in the White House. That is what this agreement is all about. It has nothing to do with opening world opportunities. Its purpose is to serve that deliberate and diabolical attempt to frustrate the decision-making ability of the Government and serve that ideological goal.

That is why the Government has a fight on its hands, one that it will lose. The sooner it calls an election so that we can prove it, the better off we will all be.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend in the Liberal Party. Let me bring to his attention a statement which was made by his Leader.