

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

President in terms of the deal he was allegedly negotiating between Canada and the United States. It was totally inconsistent with that. It is a matter that the President, in terms of his executive power in the American system of government, could have done something about this past week.

Instead of removing an iniquitous, unfair tariff that was imposed when Canadians were winning the competition, the President of the United States reimposed it. That is not only unfair and unacceptable to the people of Canada, particularly to the workers affected and the Province of British Columbia, it also reminds us that in this deal something which the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie), his predecessor, and the Prime Minister told us was not obtained in the final settlement—guaranteed access to the U.S. markets.

What this decision demonstrates, but which the Government quickly sloughed over, is that whenever Canadians win the competition whether in lumber products, steel, plastics, or any sector of the Canadian economy, the United States has the same powers to take unfair action to stop our exports. What President Reagan demonstrated last week is what we will see in the future. Under this deal we can win the competition but the Americans can stop Canadian exports. That is not fairness. That is an unfair deal.

I say to members on the Government side that these recent lay-offs in one sense were hypothetical possibilities when we debated the deal before the election. But all of these announcements I have referred to were made since the election. They are real. They are concrete. Many of those affected are no doubt neighbours of a number of Members of the House of Commons.

While the Government believes that on balance the over-all impact will be positive and will lead to more pluses than negatives—something with which we do not agree—a caring government would have come back to this Parliament and introduced at the same time as this Bill, a Bill similar to that which was brought in with the Canada-United States Auto Agreement in the 1960s. The last time there was such significant dislocation for thousands of families, legislation was brought in to cushion the impact both on workers and communities affected by that arrangement. We should have similar legislation before Parliament at least to cushion the effect on all those men and women who will be losing their jobs over the Christmas period.

We believe that such legislation requires not only provisions that allow for human compensation to working people affected in their communities. We also need a body of experts on the commission who would

determine rapidly which industries and which lay-offs were the effect of free trade.

Presently we in the House of Commons make our judgment. We do not say that they are totally conclusive. We do not say that our judgment of the plants that I just announced is infallible. However, we say that in these cases there are good reasons to believe the decisions were connected with the expectation of a free trade deal coming into effect January 1, or shortly thereafter. If the Government were sensitive it would not need to take our word for it. It ought to establish a body right now that could make a quick decision about whether any particular lay-off is related to the trade deal, if it is to make sure that compensatory action is taken.

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

• (1810)

**Mr. Broadbent:** That, I repeat, is a new and important aspect of this debate. Whatever side of the issue one was on during the election campaign, it seems to me that this Parliament of ours should now be dealing with that matter.

Another issue that concerns us is the next phase, assuming that this legislation is passed as it will be at some point, and we all know that. It will be passed, and when it goes into effect, as we all know, during the next five to seven years, there will be a discussion period, a period of negotiation between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States to sort out the definition of a subsidy.

This for all of us will be a very important process. We are concerned about it, not simply abstractly concerned, or, to take one absurd argument, not because Canadians, whether members of my Party or of any other Party, are inherently anti-American. That is just nonsense. We are concerned about the previous direction taken by American policymakers within the United States on this kind of issue in terms of negotiations not only with Canada but with other countries. We are concerned, in short, about their ideological framework and about the prevailing value system that exists in the United States when it comes to be applied to such important questions as what constitutes a legitimate subsidy.

There should be no illusions about the priority that the Americans attach to the next phase. Some experts on both sides of the border have said that the most important part of the deal for the Americans was Phase 2, if I could put it that way, the five to seven-year period in which subsidies would be discussed and definitions established. Ronald Reagan himself said to Congress on July 25: