

The Budget—Mr. Turner

in a constructive way. It seems to duplicate legislation tabled in the Ontario Legislature. It will involve every Member of Parliament. There are tremendous gaps in it. It has nothing to do with the process of letting government contracts. It has nothing to do with the process of letting government advertising. It has nothing to do with the process of making senior appointments, this patronage game that the Conservative Government under the Prime Minister has turned into a new art form. It has nothing to do with registering lobbyists, the type of lobbyists who succeeded in obtaining the bid for Terminal 3 in Toronto.

We will look at the situation constructively, but nothing in that legislation will in any way impress the Canadian people, except they will feel that it is last minute death bed repentance. They will feel that this conversion to public ethics is too late. They will not be confused by feeling that any Government can codify public conduct, public ethics, a public feeling for what is right and public judgment when the Ministers of this Government cannot comply, no matter what are the conflict of interest guidelines.

To say that this Government has not lived up to the expectations it itself created is the understatement of the decade. By all indications, it intends to approach the next election the same way it did the last. I would only caution the Prime Minister and government Members to remember the old saying when next they go before Canadians, "Once bitten, twice shy". When I went to high school in this town, we had a teacher of English who used to say to us, "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me". The Canadian people will not be fooled twice. They will render the proper judgment to the Prime Minister and his colleagues.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Canadians do not like being misled. They do not like being told that someone intends to do one thing and then does the exact opposite. This is true not only of politicians and Governments. If one pays a plumber to fix the sink, one does not expect him to tear down the garage. If one buys an airplane ticket to Vancouver, one does not expect to end up in St. John's, Newfoundland. If one buys a car that advertises 40 miles to the gallon, one feels a little disappointed if it only gets six miles to the gallon.

When a leader of a political Party, before an election, as the Prime Minister did, says that free trade affects our sovereignty and we will have none of it, Canadians expect at the very least an explanation of why the Prime Minister changed his mind. Before the election, in the Prime Minister's mind, it was a totally untouchable subject, something which would so damage our sovereignty that it was not even to be discussed. Yet only a few months later, this same Prime Minister said that it was the only solution to all our economic difficulties. It became the Government's excuse for inaction.

Our young people, looking for adequate training programs, looking for jobs and for a better future, were told to wait for

the trade deal. The Atlantic, the Gaspé, northern Ontario, the western provinces, the territories, Vancouver Island, those areas facing economic hardship, were told to wait for the trade deal. Our farmers and fishermen were told to wait for the trade deal. The whole country was put on hold waiting for the trade deal. Then when it was finally unveiled it was a shock.

The centre-piece of this Government's economic plan, in fact its only economic plan, is nothing less than the biggest sell-out of Canadian sovereignty since confederation. We waited for three years for the Government to come up with a national economic strategy and now we find that, as a result of the proposed agreement between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States, all the important and big decisions will be made in Washington.

My Party and I opposed this deal, 40 to zip, here in the House of Commons when that motion was presented in the House of Commons before Christmas. I opposed this deal because in integrating our economy and society more closely with that of the United States we are dramatically limiting our ability to make our own choices for our own future.

The Government calls it a free trade agreement. It is not a free trade agreement. Some industries are in, some industries are out. It is a selective trade agreement. One must examine it as one would any other agreement.

[*Translation*]

Just like any other contract! What did we get, what did we give up? We did not get secure access to the American market. Do not take my word for it, Mr. Speaker, read the text, read the agreement itself! Article 1904.2 specifically provides that American protectionist legislation still applies, whether we are talking about the past, the present, or the future. And the jurisdiction of the binational tribunal is not to raise objection against American protectionist laws but only to rule whether the law has been fairly applied with respect to Canadian exports.

So we did not gain secure access, secure access to the American market. If it were only a matter of lowering tariffs, good! We support that approach with the United States and with other countries. Over the past 40 years the Liberal administrations have managed to reduce tariffs from 40 down to 4 per cent—ten times more than the Conservative Government has been able to achieve through this agreement with the United States! But there is more to it than a trade deal and lower trade barriers, it is more like giving up control over our economy, over our investments, over our financial markets, over our energy policy, over the mechanisms we have to monitor our agricultural policy, maintain our culture, protect our automotive industry, everything has been abandoned and we have won precious little as a result of this agreement. That is precisely why, after scrutinizing the agreement, we are adamantly opposed to it, and not for philosophical reasons either.