

*Motion to Adjourn under S. O. 29*

● (1110)

**MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 29**CONSIDERATION OF CANADA-U.S. TRADE AGREEMENT BY  
STANDING COMMITTEE

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 29 I ask leave to propose a motion to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the decision of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade to undertake a precipitate study of the Canada-U.S. trade agreement in the absence of a complete text of that agreement and on a timetable that will not permit either adequate committee study or informed comment from Canadians before the committee prepares its report, thereby breaking the commitment of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) that the complete text of the agreement would be referred to committee for full and detailed analysis.

The House of Commons and its committees should not be made a party to what could amount to a sham or charade whereby there is the appearance of the study of the Government's trade deal with the United States when neither the House nor its committees are doing that at all. Let us have the full text of the agreement and then let Parliament and its committees study this matter.

**Mr. Lewis:** What a charade of that Standing Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member presented me, as he was bound to do, with sufficient notice. The Chair has had a chance to consider the matter. While the subject matter is of importance to all Hon. Members, it is a matter within the committee. I do not think that at this early stage it would be appropriate for the Chair to adjourn the House for a debate. However, I do thank the Hon. Member for bringing the matter to the attention of the Chair and the Chamber.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 82—CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE  
AGREEMENT—AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt—Lake Centre)** moved:

That this House condemn the government for negotiating a trade agreement with the United States that has failed to stop the predatory practices of the U.S. Export Enhancement Program, and that will;

- (a) lead to the elimination of our two-price system for wheat;
- (b) undermine the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board;
- (c) reduce the growth of supply management marketing boards;
- (d) reduce the growth opportunities for Canadian fruit and vegetable producers;
- (e) adversely affect the Canadian wine and grape industry;

(f) provide little benefit for red meat producers; and

(g) provide no new benefit for farmers purchasing farm equipment or other farm inputs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the agricultural aspects of the proposed agreement between Canada and the United States which purports to deal with free trade but is probably more correctly called a trade agreement between the two countries.

I do not think there is any doubt that this is not a good deal for agriculture or for Canadian farmers. The circumstances under which the deal was consummated left doubt as to whether the outcome would be in the best interests of Canada. The deal was arrived at in haste late at night under a deadline imposed by the American Congress.

This is an international agreement and there is great difficulty in arriving at international understandings between our countries because of the different democratic systems which we employ. The United States has a republican system and we have a parliamentary system. Under their system anything the President or his administration signs must get the approval of the House of Representatives and the Senate. In our system anything that the Prime Minister and his Ministers sign by way of international agreement becomes law virtually automatically because of the requirement for a majority in the House. Therefore, the bargaining positions of the two sides are different.

In international negotiations the Americans often use the ploy of having the executive branch of the administration sign agreements which they are fully cognizant that the Senate or House of Representatives will not accept. That does not appear to be the case with this particular agreement and that is why I, a person who finds this agreement less than good for Canada, have some difficulty knowing what I should do about it.

I realize that the Americans already perceive that they have gained a victory with this agreement. This has permeated the Senate and the House of Representatives to the point where they appear to be quite willing to endorse this agreement which is a victory for the United States. They are getting more than they are giving up. They have gained something from Canada and it is, therefore, a good deal for them.

As an opposition politician I am cognizant of the fact that any further opposition to the deal in Canada will only build on the perception across the border that this is indeed a bad deal for Canada. The obverse of that is that it is a good deal for the Americans. I face that dilemma but, being a Canadian and a representative of Canadians, I think it is my duty to speak out when faced with such a patently obvious bad deal for the interests of Canadians.

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

**Mr. Althouse:** The Government has clearly broken its trust with rural Canadians. During the negotiations the Government was as clear as possible in the House and in releases across the