

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

would expect that with his care for the rules of the House the Member would have followed that direction. I hope he would.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) is correct. I am sure the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) will be more careful.

Mr. Malone: Madam Speaker, if you check the record, I think you will find that the references I was making were references to quotes. Those are quite permissible in the House of Commons. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), of course, being a new Member, would not know that.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member should know that he cannot do indirectly what he cannot do directly. The Hon. Member should be more careful.

Mr. Malone: Madam Speaker, there is a long list of Liberals who believe that the trade arrangement is an appropriate and good move for our country. They have come on the record because they think it is important that Canadians know that the little rump opposite, that is so desperate to try to gain its position on the Government side, is up against a case of folly and is acting to the disadvantage of the potential economic and job security of our nation.

Former Liberal Cabinet Minister, Marc Lalonde, said:

"The liberalization of international trade is, more than ever, a top priority for Canada. The best strategy for Canada is to press ahead with a two-track approach: support for a new round of GATT negotiations and an early start of negotiations with the United States on a comprehensive free trade agreement."

That is what we have.

Another on that long list of Liberals who believe it is important that we secure our largest market in the world is Stuart Langford. He was not an executive assistant to Mackenzie King, Lester Pearson or Pierre Trudeau, he was a former executive assistant to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Stuart Langford said:

"Turner's position on free trade was founded not on conviction but on perceived opportunity. His "handlers" convinced him that he had to be more aggressive than Ed Broadbent. Turner bought the idea and as a result made the stupid threat to "tear up the agreement" should he win the next election. Turner's tough talk won him three minutes of coverage on television news but it destroyed three years of work in the west."

That is another person associated with the Official Opposition and who has worked with the Party for years but takes exception in the extreme to the position the Liberals are taking. It is clear to many that jobs and economic opportunities exist if we secure a trading relationship with our major trading partner, the United States of America.

● (1130)

Ron Longstaffe, a Vancouver businessman and Liberal fund raiser stated:

"It seems very unusual to elect a Member from Vancouver—Quadra to have him go to Ontario and speak out against free trade."

Ron Longstaffe, a Liberal fund raiser, does not buy this notion. Donald Macdonald, a former Liberal Cabinet Minister, called the free trade agreement a considerable achievement. He saw it in terms of a great treaty that was struck between our two countries. Noting that the New Democratic Party Leader, the Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), made the same promise, he said:

Can you imagine Mr. Broadbent going down to Washington and saying "Mr. President, I just tore up our trade agreement"? He'd just say: "That's a coincidence, Mr. Broadbent, we just tore up the Auto Pact, too". What would the Member for Oshawa say then?

The list goes on. Paul Martin is a candidate for the Liberals in the next election. He says we have to be realistic and ripping it up is not a viable alternative. The same can be said for Premier Frank McKenna, the Premier of New Brunswick, or Gerald Regan, the former Premier of Nova Scotia and former Minister for International Trade.

I simply say, Madam Speaker, that the point has been made. Mr. Regan said:

"Some people say that the pressure to compete with the U.S. under a free trade system will force us to dismantle our social programs . . . The answer, of course, is that it will not. Such claims are unmitigated nonsense and scare tactics . . ."

Those are the words uttered by a Liberal Cabinet Minister in the Government just previous to ours. He says that to talk about the dismantling of our social programs because of the trade agreement is unmitigated nonsense and scare tactics.

The first thing we all have to recognize in this debate about trade is the importance of trade to Canada. It comprises one-third of our wealth. One-third of everything we have comes from trade. It is also important to recognize that 80 per cent of our exports go to the United States. That is where it goes today.

In the beginning of this century we traded mostly with north European countries, particularly Great Britain. In the evolution of time, Britain has gone into the European Common Market. We are almost shut out from being able to sell to Great Britain. The amount we sell there is very minimal. We sell most of our export to the United States, nearly 80 per cent, yet we are faced with legislation upon legislation which are putting up walls and barriers, tariffs and non-tariff duties that will not allow Canadians to penetrate the U.S. market in a secure way. So we need an agreement not to dismantle all of the rules of trade, but to put rules of trade there, so there will be fairness and so that we can continue to export to a larger market and, because of that larger market, have the capacity, excellence and skills to penetrate markets in all parts of the world.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments to make to which the Hon. Member perhaps could respond. He used a familiar argument, that tariffs have come down between 1944 and 1988, and this has not posed a threat to our culture or to a variety of other things that opponents of the free trade agreement now claim will be threatened. He posed