

ties, we see we exported almost \$83 billion in 1984, which is the last year for which I have firm figures. That year we shipped the United States \$2.2 billions worth of agricultural products, or less than 2 per cent of our shipments to the United States were agricultural products. The United States shipped to us some \$68.5 billion worth of commodities, \$3.6 billion of which were agricultural commodities, or just over 5 per cent of the total trade with us, leaving a total trade deficit for our country of about \$1.4 billion.

Since the Americans feel that they are already being put upon in the agricultural sector and because they now have, and have had, a positive trade balance with Canada, and see Canada as one place where they can expand that trade balance, we are quite convinced, as is any objective observer, that they will be continuing to press for agricultural items to be on the table and for further access to our market. It is not just my opinion but the opinion of Professor Warley of the University of Guelph.

With respect to the area of livestock and meat trade, there is some possibility that Canada would continue to have a positive export in those particular sectors. We have had good access to their markets, prior to the commencement of the trade negotiations, I might add. Since the enhanced trade talks have begun, in areas in which we did have free trade on an agreement basis for as long as 40 or 50 years we have lost ground. Prior to the initiation of the talks almost 80 per cent of the goods and services that trade back and forth across our borders were free of any financial or other trade impediment. However, two years after the summit at which the talks were initiated, thanks to the actions taken with respect to live hogs, saltfish and softwood lumber, we are not approaching 70 per cent of trade between our two nations without financial impediment. This is what Progressive Conservatives call progress!

We have gone from 80 per cent free trade down to 70 per cent free trade. It is my personal opinion that the Government has been looking at the wrong aspect of our trade relations. I think it has not put on the table at all the question of

dispute settlement. Nearly 80 per cent of our products were moving free of any impediment before these so-called talks began. The main problem we had was one of how to cope with the actions of the International Trade Commission under the U.S. Department of Commerce. That quasi-judicial body is able to act must faster than is any similar body in Canada. The activities of that body have been increased because of protectionist sentiment by agricultural producers—in fact, all producers—in the United States, as they witness their deteriorating position *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world in terms of world trade. We find ourselves being constantly dragged before this court at the behest of American producers. Even though we have gone through the process and proven ourselves to be free of any subsidies, or any other problems, they continue to bring us back. Softwood lumber is just one case in point. We proved three or four years ago that we did not have an unwarranted amount of subsidy lying in the method of calculating stumpage fees. We were brought before the ITC just recently. In fact, the Government negotiated away our position and has brought us down to the point where close to 70 per cent of our commodities are trading free of any financial impediments, as opposed to the 80 per cent level at which we started.

The motion before us is an attempt for the Government to mollify people who have looked at this situation realistically and carefully, as I have and as my colleagues have. The Government is attempting to tell us that it would never allow full and open discussion on the question of protecting our sovereignty on social programs, agricultural marketing systems, the auto industry and our unique cultural identity. Because of the large majority in the House the motion will pass. There are 208 Conservative Members who will make certain that it passes. The Government will take this as its reason for continuing the talks.

The motion may pass, but Canadians will not believe that their culture, their agriculture, their social programs and their unique identity is safe.