

Supply

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry, please.

Mr. Brisco: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) will also have his turn. One only needs to read the admission of Marc Lalonde to understand the process and exactly where that Government was headed. It wanted to crush and cripple the economic strength of Alberta. There is no other answer to that question. It is a matter of record from the mouth of the man who performed the act.

Finally, referring to the concern of the Hon. Member with regard to cuts in research, to make it simple for him, I suggest that he turn to page 4 of today's *Quorum* wherein it indicates "Government pledge of \$1 billion for research not smoke and mirrors". I invite him to read that and then recant.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, the first point raised by the Hon. Member is probably the major one. I draw his attention to the fact that we are not only criticizing and opposing. Our Leader came to the House, in June to deliver a speech on trade, which is something his Leader has not done, that contained some positive elements in the context of the free trade debate. I do not know about what the Hon. Member is talking. He was probably not here the day the Leader of our Party was in the House and delivered that speech. Today three of the six opposition speeches were from our side of the House. We even delivered to the eager-beaver Parliamentary Secretary a copy of the speech by our Leader to indicate to him the direction we would be taking in terms of policy matters. Concerning—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Lethbridge—Foothills (Mr. Thacker).

Mr. Caccia: I was asked three questions, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Lethbridge—Foothills.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member opposite elaborate upon the purchase of high-sulphur coal by Ontario Hydro from the United States with the outflow of Canadian dollars? How could that be reversed, in terms of acid rain and the outflow of dollars by the purchase of low-sulphur western coal? While he was the Minister of the Environment it was probably one of the dossiers on which he worked. Would he advise the House what he did when he was Minister of the Environment to convince Ontario Hydro to use low-sulphur western coal rather than high-sulphur U.S. coal?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I remind the Hon. Member that the report on high-sulphur coal was published just a few weeks ago. The matter was studied as part of an initiative going back to Liberal times. However, the results were published and given to us in a report just a few weeks ago. Therefore it is a measure which is being advanced or put on the agenda, so to speak, in 1986. It is a very interesting measure, and I am glad the Hon. Member is interested in it.

If we proceed under a free trade negotiation scheme which includes the national treatment clause, we will not be in a position to make use of our own coal from the West to create jobs in the West and to reduce pollution in the East. I hope the Hon. Member understands what the national treatment clause entails and implies. It is a very restrictive clause which will not make it possible for us to use our western coal.

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, I know you are a biblical scholar and that you are quite aware of the point in the *Bible* where Jesus said that those who are not against us are for us.

I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the Hon. Member this afternoon. I listened as well to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). Time and time again I listened to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) over the last two years. I am still unable to figure out whether they are against us or for us.

Could the Hon. Member give us his own personal view on whether he believes that the Government of Canada should have commenced trade negotiations with the United States? Second, I should like his own personal view on whether he believes those trade negotiations should now be suspended. Third, I should like to know what is the official policy of his Party on whether trade negotiations should have ever been commenced with the United States. Fourth, I should like to know the official policy of his Party on whether or not those negotiations should now be suspended.

I have listened to his Leader and to the trade critic of the Liberal Party and I am still confused on whether or not they are for us or against us.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member for York East is still unclear on where we stand, I can only attribute it to his lack of perception and capability to listen carefully. He has heard several speeches; he has heard us on a variety of occasions. He knows exactly what we are saying. We are saying that we want the pursuit of the reduction of trade barriers to be global. We do not believe in continentalism. We do not believe that it would be in Canada's best interest to engage in a negotiation on a one-to-one basis between us, a fairly small economy, and the Americans, a very large and powerful economy. Our best interest would be better protected in the context of the international global community with all 160 nations participating in the process of a GATT tariff reduction, rather than engaging in the construction of another market like the European one which in the end causes many hardships for those who are kept outside.

The Hon. Member also heard me saying that I am very worried about the terminology used in calling these talks free or freer trade negotiations. In the long term they will lead to economic union, which is not our political idea. I do not think it is the political goal of my Party, but it may be that of the Hon. Member's Party. Traditionally, until 50 years or 60 years ago, it was not. However that Party is entitled to change. We will certainly compare and confront each other with our views on the subject in the next election.