

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[English]***TRADE**

CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister gave up Canadian sovereignty without a single shot being fired.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): He sold out our farmers, textile workers, auto workers, cultural industries, natural resources, economic independence and sovereignty. What did he get in return? Did he get an exemption from American trade law or U.S. protectionism? All he got was a statement from the Executive Office of the President of the U.S. which says:

The U.S. anti-dumping law . . . will remain intact and unchanged. Hence, U.S. petitioners will retain all their rights under existing U.S. law.

In other words, Canada will get the same rotten deal in the future that we got on softwood lumber, potash, fish, and even raspberries. Why did the Prime Minister give away the store and get nothing worth-while in return?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, obviously the premise of the right hon. gentleman's statement is inaccurate and very misleading. With reference to the dispute settlement mechanism he refers to something from the Executive Office of the President. I refer him to a document I tabled this morning which says that the decision of the panel shall be binding on the parties. That is an important step forward, one of many.

Since he concerns himself specifically with that point and raises the question of softwood lumber and potash, to illustrate what has been achieved I can tell him that in future softwood lumber and potash would not be subject to arbitrary U.S. action. The issues would now go to a binding dispute mechanism for resolution, and that is a very important gain for Canada.

BINDING DISPUTE SETTLEMENT MECHANISM

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister confirm that according to the summary provided by the U.S. trade representative, the dispute settlement panel will apply American law and rules and leave us in the same weak position as we were when we were so badly treated on those issues I have mentioned? To quote the American summary:

—the decision of the American Commerce Department and the ITC can be overturned only if they are not supported by substantial evidence or otherwise not in accordance with U.S. law.

• (1420)

Is it not true that United States law has not changed, that it is still applicable to Canadian exports, and that we have received no exemption from it? Will he not admit, therefore, that he has not achieved the key element which he sought to achieve and promised to achieve, an exemption from American protectionism?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that my right hon. friend chooses to quote, as he calls it, the American summary. Why does he not start quoting the Canadian summary?

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Because you didn't give us one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Stand up for Canada.

Mr. Mulroney: Why does someone who dislikes the Americans so much not stand up for Canada for once?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Mulroney: Rather than quote an American summary, why does the Hon. Member not quote a document which was tabled on the floor of the House of Commons this morning which says:

The decision of a panel shall be binding on the Parties and their investigating authorities. The panel may uphold or remand the decision to the relevant investigating authority for action not inconsistent with such decision.

The application of the arrangement represents a major departure from existing traditions and a substantial gain for Canada in terms of security of access to the great American market that we have been seeking.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, the dispute mechanism may be binding if it is in accord with the U.S. Constitution. Whether it is binding or not, it applies American law and American rules. That's what kind of deal this is.

[Translation]

INQUIRY WHAT GOVERNMENT HAS OBTAINED

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, have the Americans changed the rules on subsidies? No. Have they amended their foreign trade laws? No. Have they made Canada exempt from their countervail measures? No. Have they made us exempt from their antidumping law? No. What, then, has the Prime Minister obtained in return for sacrificing our automobile and textile workers, our cultural industries, our natural resources, our economic independence and our Canadian sovereignty? What did he get in return?