

*Supply*

Very clearly this industry does not like the free trade agreement one bit.

● (1720)

Why did we get into the free trade discussions to start with, particularly when we knew of the commitments made by the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) when he campaigned for the Leadership of the Conservative Party some time ago? The Prime Minister had a conversion on the way to Damascus because he decided that in view of U.S. protectionism we needed to secure our access to the American markets, or so he said, and, second, we should have an independent dispute settling mechanism. That sounds nice, perhaps, to some people. However, what did we get? We got a dispute settling mechanism that is going to work using American laws, and as if that were not bad enough, we have a binding dispute settling mechanism which is binding on Canadians but potentially not on the United States. Of course, as we know, under the U.S. Constitution it is impossible to provide measures in such a way as to link a future Congress of the United States. In other words, if the Americans wanted to change their laws in the future which would make certain things countervailable that are not so now, we have no means of stopping a future U.S. Congress from doing so.

The problem, of course, is going to be, and is for us, that the alleged gains we would have from signing such an agreement have not happened, and in return we have given far too much away to the United States in order to secure a so-called comprehensive bilateral free trade agreement.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, I hear an Hon. Member opposite saying we did not give that much.

For the past 15 minutes now, Madam Speaker, I have been explaining to Hon. Members what we gave and what we did not get in return, and he does not understand anything. He does not understand anything. Well, that is too bad for him. I am sure his constituents will give him a lesson if he will not learn by listening to Hon. Members in this House.

The wine and grape industry, for instance, Madam Speaker, what did it gain from that free trade agreement? And I now ask this House: What did it lose? The wine and grape industry has lost its livelihood or will lose most of it. What did it gain? Next to nothing.

Madam Speaker, many other Canadian industries are losing out.

In conclusion, the withdrawal of seasonal tariffs, for instance, in the fruits and vegetables industry, in the market-gardening industry, is clear indication of another major loss. And the Hon. Member opposite who comes from southwestern Ontario knows that. I suggest he take a position on that issue because producers in his area have lost a lot. The chicken industry has lost, the dairy industry has lost, market-gardening has lost. How many other farm industries have, and will lose

out when we see the list of detailed documents? Madam Speaker, we have lost enough. In my view, producers in my constituency should not be forced to lose anything more than they already have.

[*English*]

I would ask the Conservative Members opposite to shake up their Prime Minister and convince him that he should not be signing that free trade agreement. Not only is it not good for the majority of Canadians, a fact which is already established, but it is not good for the Canadian farming industry. It is not good for agriculture. The agreement is bad for Canada. It is bad for agriculture, and the farmers of my riding will not forgive the Tories opposite. They have breached a solemn promise they made to the people of my riding and to all Canadians. Canadians will not forget. They will remember the Tories in the next election. If there are any Tories left in the constituency I represent after the next election, I am sure they will be called upon to answer to the people of Canada. They will be asked to explain why they have betrayed the mandate that was given to them.

The Prime Minister keeps talking about his sacred trust and those commitments he has made, and so on. Well, he has breached a solemn commitment he made in 1983, and many times there after. If I were the Prime Minister, I would change my mind right now, because it is not too late for him to repent. It is not too late for him to tell the people of Canada that he goofed, that he is sorry for what he did. We are willing to give him a second chance. We are willing to do that. It is up to him now to apologize to the people of Canada for having done what he did. He should start over, and this time he should do it right. I am willing to give him a chance. Let us see him do it.

**Mr. Clifford:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member talked about our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the commitments he made to agriculture, but he did not tell us specifically which commitments the Prime Minister has not kept. I have been waiting to hear what they are. The Hon. Member talks about his farmers and the problems he is having with the free trade agreement. Can he specifically tell me what is going on with the dairy farmers in his riding? Is there a problem there? The Hon. Member was not specific. We pledged that the marketing and supply system of this country would not be altered. Is the Hon. Member telling us that that has been done? I would like to hear the answer to that in specific terms. Exactly what is the Hon. Member's problem with our commitment to the marketing and supply systems for agriculture in this country and how they are potentially going to be dealt with in the agreement?

● (1730)

I want to know specifically what it is he is communicating to his constituents. I believe it is the job of all Members of Parliament to communicate and to give information, certainly to tell the truth to the primary producers. I do not think that has been very clear in the dialogue so far.