

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

● (1200)

**Mr. Crosbie:** As Ambassador Gottlieb has stated:

The U.S. political system is well adapted to allowing the 'losers' to seek protection... This is an age of special interests. The [U.S.] legislative agenda is now run largely by committee and sub-committee chairmen... beyond the control of any President. They interact with highly motivated, handsomely financed special interest groups, seeking legislative fixes to their problems.

That is what we face in Washington. Those "fixes" for U.S. industry are protectionist measures.

We have heard the Opposition in the House, time after time in the last year or two, going on about these protectionist measures that U.S. congressmen implement, trying to blame them on us and the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement, instead of blaming them on the U.S. system. How can they blame them on the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement when we have not yet got it? Why don't they support the agreement which will help protect us from these fixes?

Ambassador Gottlieb further stated:

The free trade agreement will go a long way to substituting the rule of law for the politics of protectionism. For the smaller partner in the world's largest bilateral trading relationship, that will be a very significant achievement.

This is a man who knows. He has been on the scene for seven years. He was appointed to Washington by a Liberal Government, and continued on by our Government. We recognize merit when we see it. In addition, Mr. Gottlieb is a public servant. He knows the system, and his testimony is that it is a very significant achievement. That is what the free trade agreement is all about. Long-term solutions based on reciprocal principles, not raw political and economic power. We cannot win in the battle of raw political and economic power with the United States. It is ten times our size. If, by some misadventure, Mr. Turner got into office, or Mr. Broadbent, or a combination, say, Mr. Broadbent, or Mr. Benturn, or Mr. Turnbent, if a combination of those two parties got into office, can one see them taking on the United States with all its raw political and economic power? Can one see them engage in a battle?

While I think of it, Madam Speaker, I might point out that the Leader of the national Liberal Party suggested blithely that he will tear up the free trade agreement. This is the most irresponsible statement by a leader of a national Party since 1867. In fact, one would have to go back to Polybius in 50 B.C., or somewhere back beyond that to get a sillier statement. At different times he has said different things. He will negotiate a new free trade agreement, or he will negotiate a sectoral series of agreements, or he will take the trade personnel from External Affairs where Trudeau put them four or five years ago and put them back in the trade department. Imagine the astounding gall. The crowd that scrambled the eggs is now going to unscramble them and put them all back in

### *Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

a separate Department, and that will cure all Canada's trade problems.

Ann Hughes, a member of the American Government in the Trade Office in the United States spoke in Canada. She was asked whether there was any chance, if Canada turned down this U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement, that another one could be negotiated. She gave the perfect answer to that. She said that it would be disingenuous for anyone to think that if we turned down this arrangement there will be another one for many, many years. Disingenuous is putting it politely. It is dishonest to even suggest that it could be done.

**Mr. Langdon:** Good.

**Mr. Crosbie:** The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) says: "Good". He does not want a trade agreement with the United States. This is astounding. The Hon. Member, who is from Windsor where the whole prosperity is based on Canada-U.S. trade, says that he does not want a trade agreement with the United States. This is astounding. This is academia gone nuts—academia nuts, I suppose, Madam Speaker.

Not only our security of access but our sovereignty is strengthened, as I said, by putting our trade relations with the U.S. on the basis of equally binding legal principles. Security of access means preserving Canadian jobs and industries that might be threatened in the future. It means preserving Canadian jobs. It means creating new jobs in Canada because of our more secure access to the United States market.

Alastair McEachen, President of the Retail Council of Canada, stated:

There are a lot of investments, mostly European, waiting to be made in Canada once the free trade pact is in force. Canadian companies are also waiting for the free trade outcome before investing in their own operations.

Many investments are waiting to be made here. Who is keeping them waiting? The Opposition is keeping them waiting. Who is creating the uncertainty? The NDP and the Liberal Opposition is creating the uncertainty. Who is the worst offender? A man who should understand this. A man who went with McMillan, Binch and pretended to be *au coeur*, bosom to bosom with, and in sympathy with the business community of Canada for the years 1970-75—when he fled the scene here—until 1984. He should understand this.

Who is creating the delay and the uncertainty, preventing the investments from pouring in here now, and preventing Canadian businesses from getting ready to take advantage of the free trade agreement because they do not know when it is going to come into effect? It is the Leader of the Opposition, and I will touch on this a little later, who called on the Liberal majority in the Senate to say that they would not put this through until there was an election. We have no binding commitment that they will put it through if there is an election, Madam Speaker. I do not trust them one bit.