

Bretton Woods Agreements Act

as the Hon. Member mentioned, we will put ourselves in the position of being able to offer more to needy people in developing countries. We must live up to our international responsibilities through agreements such as the Bretton Woods.

I would like to extend an invitation. The Hon. Member sounds very much like a Tory these days. I congratulate him on that. I would like to invite him to join this Government and occupy the seat behind me. I would be very happy to have him do that whenever he so wishes.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, first, I would advise the Hon. Member to take a look at his Government's spending Estimates. He thinks the house is in order, but if the Government is spending \$105 billion with a deficit which is rapidly approaching \$40 billion dollars, the house is not in order. It is true that cuts were made, but the Government has also made some big new expenditures. It has dressed up the military in brand new uniforms, it is contributing to the modernization of the Dew Line, for who knows what reason, and the deficit and the national debt continue to grow. Therefore, before the Hon. Member extends an invitation for me to sit beside him, he had better do a careful analysis of the Estimates. I can tell him, if that is getting the house in order, it is a very lackadaisical way of going about it.

● (1650)

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, are we to take it from the comments of the Hon. Member that he is in opposition to the changes in spouse's allowance, the increase in veteran's pension and the reduction in the sales tax on farm fuels and primary producers? Is he saying that he opposes those measures?

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, what I would be most interested in knowing from the Hon. Minister is where he is going to get the money to put all of those trains back in operation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The period for questions and comments is now terminated. We shall resume debate.

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to take over what the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) was going to say. I put it to the House that when we listen to the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) speak, he really does sound like he should be sitting next to those Hon. Members opposite. I venture to say that had we put a bag over his head before he began to speak we certainly would not have known whether he was a Conservative or a Liberal. We have maintained in the House all along, Mr. Speaker, that there really is no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) has the floor.

Mr. Skelly: When we look back over the last Parliament, Mr. Speaker, we certainly realize that the decimation which Hon. Members of the Liberal Party underwent during the last election was substantially as a result of their attempts to disguise themselves as Conservatives in the very unpopular programs they produced. One thing the Conservative Government has in common with the Liberals is that it has the knack of taking a Liberal catastrophe and making it worse. Had I the time, and were we considering a different sort of order of business before the House, I would be prepared to elaborate on that.

I would like to examine the Bill before us in the context of sovereignty. An Hon. Member of our Party who spoke previously indicated some serious elements of concern about the sovereignty effects of these particular funds and the role which the United States plays in world development through these agencies, the large voice it has in it and the kind of philosophical approach it takes to providing assistance. He did raise the critical question of sovereignty. Before I move on I would like to take a look at the question of sovereignty in a broader context, and then in summary look at the Bill in that way.

Let us consider the idea of Canadian sovereignty. In the seven months the Conservative Government has been in power we have probably seen a greater erosion of Canadian sovereignty than since the time of the second world war. In those seven months we have probably lost more in Canadian sovereignty, moved further backwards, than we have since the second world war. I would point to the announcement today by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) with respect to the new agreement with the United States. Of course, the United States is our partner in the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the international finance agencies. It has the largest say and dominates the over-all game plan, and if one doesn't play its way it takes its marbles and goes home, as it has done in other international agencies. The American philosophy prevails. It is the philosophy of President Reagan, and when we come to this defence agreement, we know full well who is calling the shots.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that during questioning in the House the Government was unwilling to put the documents before this Parliament under some thin guise that somehow it would profoundly change the nature of Government in Canada. That is absolute, patent nonsense. It would simply give legislators in this House the opportunity to examine things which affect their sovereignty.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), in upgrading the north warning system, is becoming involved in cost-sharing with the United States on American military hardware, on an American military defence program and an American worldwide defence strategy about which the Americans make the decisions. That is an erosion of Canadian sovereignty. It is a long-term binding agreement which apparently has no safety valves which would allow us to get out of it in an appropriate manner.

We are in serious trouble with this Conservative Government. It is not just content to tag \$7 billion to the United