

*Oral Questions*

● (1420)

*[English]*

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the Chair could help. I apologize to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition for interrupting, but there is a long standing rule about not referring to the absence of Members.

There has also been a long standing custom that, when asking questions of the Treasury bench, the questioner starts off by saying—if in fact the Minister is absent to whom the Member wishes to direct his or her question—“in the absence of the Minister for so and so, I will direct my question to—”. That is a perfectly proper procedure. The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition is absolutely correct in his approach.

**Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, some of the backbenchers, the trained seals of the Conservative Party, need a rest. We understand that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):** I think some of them have started the party early today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** We certainly are not starting the Question Period early.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition could try again.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister, a very simple question because here in the House we are always trying to elicit very clear and very specific answers.

The Deputy Prime Minister knows full well that the Prime Minister has been arguing that his free trade agreement with the United States guarantees that Canada will be fully exempt from existing and future American trade laws.

Mr. Speaker, Article 1904.2 of the agreement provides, and I quote: “—the antidumping and countervailing duty statutes of the Parties, as those statutes may be amended from time to time, are incorporated into this agreement.” In other words, the agreement directly contradicts the Prime Minister.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister explain and give us a reason for this?

*[English]*

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I did not get all of the Right Hon. Member's question, but I certainly point out that Article 1904 says:

—the Parties shall replace judicial review of final antidumping and countervailing duty determinations with binational panel review.

That, of course, confirms what we have said, that we are going to have a binational panel review and that we are providing ourselves with time to develop new trade remedy laws appropriate to one single market.

I think it would be more appropriate, rather than picking out specific clauses in the Free Trade Agreement—

**Mr. Riis:** We would not want to do that.

**Miss Carney:** —for the Right Hon. Member to read the whole Chapter of the agreement because each Article relates to other Articles in the Chapter as is normal in treaty language.

## GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I turn then to the Minister. Is she suggesting that we not read the document? Is she suggesting we do not refer it to Parliament and that we accept the Prime Minister's and her statement as to what is in it?

I want to bring the Minister back to her own document which says on page 273 that American anti-dumping law and countervailing laws future and present apply against Canada. Why then does the Minister claim that Canada has been exempted from American trade law when it is not the case? Why then does the Minister claim that we have somehow got guaranteed access to the American market, something which in light of the text we clearly have not? Why does the Minister not admit that she and her colleagues, led by the Prime Minister, failed to obtain for Canada what they undertook to obtain?

● (1425)

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that I am urging all Hon. Members to read this agreement, and particularly members of the Opposition who, through their speeches and public statements, have made it clear that they have not read the agreement and do not know what is in it.

I have never said when talking about the Free Trade Agreement that Canada is exempt from trade law. I have said repeatedly, over and over again, that we set up a binational review for a period of five years plus two so that we could develop common trade law that applies to one market. I said that over and over. I have explained to the House that through many, many difficult negotiations, we were unable to do that in the time period preceding October 4. I have said over and over that in the meantime we have set in these interim measures and we will be addressing this question in the time period we have set. For the Right Hon. Member to suggest otherwise is misleading the House and Canadians.