

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

the rhetorical question: Why should these things be any more threatened by the elimination of the remaining tariffs than they were threatened by the elimination of 80 per cent of the tariffs that have been eliminated since 1944? I hope I have made the argument correctly on behalf of the Hon. Member.

I think we have an obligation to understand what the various sides are saying. What has been wrong with this debate is that sometimes deliberately, and we have to assume sometimes not deliberately, people have caricatured what the other side has had to say. The New Democratic Party has never maintained that it is the elimination of tariffs that is the threat to our culture or sovereignty. That is not a claim we have ever made, but we have made a claim about the effects of the entire agreement, which I hope the Hon. Member will admit is more than simply the elimination of tariffs.

If all we had before us was the elimination of tariffs, then we would have quite a different agreement. The fact is, in order to get the elimination of those remaining tariffs, which the Government views as desirable, and in order to get the dispute settlement mechanism, which the Government views as desirable, but which was not what the Government set out to get by the admission of even some supporters of the agreement, such as the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount (Mr. Johnston), whom the Member just quoted, the Government proceeded to arrive at an agreement on a number of other matters which are quite separate from the traditional question of the value of eliminating tariffs, on questions having to do with foreign investment, energy, services and the cultural industries, and so on. All these were separate questions and were dealt with separately and were Canada's own business at the time of the coming down of the tariffs to which the Hon. Member referred.

Either the Member misunderstands our position or he has misrepresented it. The fact is that the claim with respect to the elimination of tariffs having all these effects is not a claim the NDP has ever made. It is a claim we make on the basis of the whole agreement. I see the Member is being coached by the Parliamentary Secretary.

**Mr. Darling:** And a good coach too.

**Mr. Blaikie:** I would have hoped the Member was conversant with the agreement and did not need to be coached by the Parliamentary Secretary. The Member mentioned the former Liberal Cabinet Minister, Mr. Macdonald, who was in charge of the Royal Commission on Economic Development, as a supporter of the agreement, but it also remains the case, for instance, that the Royal Commission headed by Mr. Macdonald did not even look at the question of services. Yet that is something we have in this agreement, and which was not recommended.

There are a lot of things I think should at least be acknowledged. If the Member wants to criticize our position, we have an obligation to respond. There is enough to legitimately disagree about. We do not have to invent things to disagree

about. We have lots to disagree about. The claim the Member says we have made about tariffs is a claim we have not made.

**Mr. Malone:** Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) is quite right. We have enough we can disagree about without inventing things. That is why I did not invent anything. That is why it is important to point out the very elements of fear that the NDP and Liberals are now raising, and particularly I say that to the NDP because it was that Party which used exactly the same arguments some 23 or 24 years ago when it opposed the Auto Pact. The NDP told us all of the same things that would happen. The Auto Pact was going to somehow threaten Canada. Today we export two cars for every one we consume in Canada. The Auto Pact has put one-half a trillion dollars investment into southern Ontario in the 23 years of its existence. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill said: "You missed the point. It is not just about tariffs. It is about something beyond that". He is right. It also deals with the non-tariff barriers.

● (1140)

Then he made a very specific point, the one which I want to come to now. He said: "It deals with things like services". It is clear to this House, to Canadians and to all who have studied this issue that members of the New Democratic Party are saying: "We are not going to have anything to do with this deal. We are going to stick with GATT. That is our model".

The Uruguay Round on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is studying services. It is looking at the whole element of bringing barriers to services between countries down. Thus what the Hon. Member is saying is only inconsistent within himself. The New Democratic Party's view is to favour the GATT relationships around the world. GATT is the very agency that at this time is studying the removal of barriers on services, not between two countries on a bilateral basis but between many countries on a multilateral basis.

I say to members of the NDP: You cannot have it all ways. That Party is basically trying to proclaim that this agreement fits all the old arguments that its Members used more than 20 years ago when they opposed the Auto Pact, as well as when they opposed the Auto Pact amendments in the early 1970s. When this agreement was coming forward, they suddenly stood up in unison as a Party and with one arm straight in the air said: "Don't you dare touch the Auto Pact". They now use the same elements of argument to try to make Canadians believe that this relationship that will secure our markets, our economy and our jobs has the same evils that they imagined some 20 years ago. They were wrong then and they are wrong today.

**Mr. Langdon:** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) if he is aware of who was the biggest opponent, the harshest critic of the Auto Pact in the House of Commons in 1965. I wonder if he knows that the harshest critic, the one with the most flowing rhetoric possible