

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

they will see that it is simply not the case that they will get secure, guaranteed access as promised in 1985.

Just last week I talked to some businessmen who said that that is not important, that if they are further harassed by the United States industry they can move their factories to Alabama.

Mr. McDermid: Who said that?

Mr. Kilgour: Give us the names.

Mr. Axworthy: We will provide all the information, just like the Government does. We will provide it.

Mr. Kilgour: Put up or shut up.

Mr. McDermid: Why doesn't he move them there now?

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, to answer the Parliamentary Secretary, the fact is that it is already happening and many of them have.

Mr. McDermid: At least be honest in your presentation.

Mr. Axworthy: They want to talk about being honest. Talking about honesty, let me refer back to what the Prime Minister said about free trade with the U.S.

Mr. Nunziata: Lyin' Brian.

Mr. McDermid: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Two Members of Parliament, one from York whatever and one from Algoma called the Prime Minister a liar just now. I would like both the Hon. Members to stand up and withdraw their remarks.

Mr. Nunziata: Take your marbles and go home.

Mr. Hopkins: Can't take the heat.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): It has been very difficult in the last few seconds for the Speaker to hear what was being said on the floor of the House of Commons as there were exchanges between the two sides of the House. I am sure that if some Hon. Members did use some unparliamentary language, they will have the courage to do the honourable thing and apologize. I have to bow to Hon. Members' honesty. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) has the floor.

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, I sat for an hour and three-quarters this morning through the speech of the Minister for International Trade. On numerous occasions he called the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) a liar and said that he used mistruths. He said the same thing about the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. McDermid: No he didn't.

Mr. Axworthy: I did not see the Parliamentary Secretary rise to his feet at that time. If there is any side guilty of purple

probe, of making unbiased allegations, I suggest that the Parliamentary Secretary read the "blues" of the speech of his Minister this morning and he will see the worst example of the use of debasement in a speech in this House on the most serious topic we have ever heard. I only wish that he would apply the same standard to his Minister as he wants to apply to Members on this side of the House.

The two major counts which the Government has put forward as the rationale for this agreement come up as failures. There are very serious questions about the so-called benefits. If the benefits are so meaningless and limited, why do they persist? It is interesting to note that when the trade negotiator, Mr. Reisman, withdrew from the table saying that he could not get what he thought was a fair deal for the country, or words to that effect, it was the political people who brought him back in.

I think the answer to the question lies in the substantial part of the accord. I think the real reason we have a total flip-flop on the part of the Prime Minister and his colleagues since 1983 lies in other parts of the agreement which do not deal with trade at all but with the basic domestic institutions and practices of the country. What you see is a concerted, coherent attempt to enfeeble the Governments of Canada. It is a clear expression of the neo-Conservative philosophy which says that it is the market-place of North America that will make decisions for Canadians and not Government, the public sector, people speaking through their elected representatives, or people relying upon public initiative. It is purely the market-place that will decide.

The philosophy expressed by the merchant class of Montreal in 1849 is now coming home to roost in 1989. They do not want to share power. The real issue in this debate is about who governs Canada, who is going to make the decisions, and who the decisions are going to be made for. As you go through the agreement you will see all the non-trade related items. What does investment have to do with trade? That was part of the trade-off with the Reagan administration.

It is instructive to read the words of Mr. Reisman speaking to the Ontario Economic Council in May of 1985 when he said, "A major difficulty in negotiating a bilateral agreement with the United States is that the economic benefits from free trade are likely to be asymmetrical and the Americans will have to seek concrete benefits in other areas".

The same formula applies whether you talk about this comprehensive agreement or another comprehensive agreement. We have to put more chips on the table than we have in trade so we end up having to put energy, investment, services, and the various domestic sectors of our economy on the table because we do not have enough to play with. The United States is 10 times our size. That was the message of Mr. Reisman. Mr. Reisman's conclusion in the speech was that we could get a deal if we put water on the table. He talked about the Grand Trunk Canal and all the rest of it. We know that