

George Van Roggen is a Liberal but his head is screwed on right. In addition to that, he has a backbone. There are many Liberals that are not going to swallow this stuff. We can and should have the benefits of both bilateral and multilateral trading arrangements.

Now the Liberals say they will seek sectoral free trade agreements with the U.S., not a comprehensive trade agreement as has been negotiated. That is something new. That did not appear in the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry's statement of June 14. It came up since, as I explained. The sector-by-sector approach was tried in 1983-1984 and it did not work. I have the reasons here. I won't read them now because of the time I have taken, but at page 10 of the transcript of Gerry Regan's broadcast on CTV, CJOH, April 10, 1988, he explains why the sector-by-sector approach did not work and could not work and will not work now. It will not work because the U.S. wanted to negotiate in sectors in which they believed they had an advantage while Canada wanted to negotiate in sectors in which we thought we had an advantage, and we could get nowhere.

● (1240)

In addition, if you did work out a sectoral agreement you had to have special permission from the other member states in GATT. GATT does not allow sectoral free trade agreements between members. It only allows comprehensive agreements such as we have negotiated with the U.S. Gerry Regan said:

When I was a member of Mr. Trudeau's Government, I recognized the importance of obtaining better guarantees of access to the vital American market . . . I have come to the conclusion that the present free trade project is a more meaningful, courageous and important undertaking . . . more important than our limited negotiations in (1983-84).

The third element of the latest Liberal plan was to emphasize trade with Europe and the Pacific Rim. We did that in 1985. In our national trade strategy we established a major new initiative directed toward the Pacific. Where has the Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry been for the last four years? Where was he when the then Minister for International Trade, the Member for Vancouver Centre, was adopting this new national trade policy, this major new initiative directed to the Pacific?

We have established new trade offices in Osaka, Shanghai, Bombay, and Auckland. Where were they when this was going on? They have now adopted this as a brave new policy when we already did this three years ago. Partly as a result, our trade with Japan is surging. It now accounts for \$15 billion a year. The recent dramatic rise in our exports to Japan has re-established our trade surplus with that vital trading partner. Where was the great trade critic of the Liberal Party when all of this was going on? Why does he only wake up after the fact and discover what is happening in the Pacific Rim and what we have done, which our predecessor Government did not do? What a dynamite policy the hon. gentleman came forward with.

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

The idea that we can increase trade with other countries to substitute trade with the U.S. runs contrary to the plain facts of commerce and geography. Mr. Diefenbaker wanted to increase our share of trade with Great Britain instead of the United States and it did not work. Mr. Trudeau had a third option in the early seventies. He wanted to direct us away from the U.S. to Europe. It did not work. The sensible goal is a balanced trade strategy, which is what we are pursuing. We are seeking new markets where there is an opportunity to do so. That is called common sense.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The Liberal alternative to the FTA is not an alternative at all. It ignores the threat of U.S. protectionism. It expresses high hopes for what the MTN may be able to achieve if 95 member states agree, and it ignores the benefits in terms of security of access and dispute achievement settlement achieved under the free trade agreement. About this *The Ottawa Citizen* said:

The five-point plan the Liberal leader would implement as Prime Minister would replace the free trade deal with a rehash of tried and failed policies and motherhood statements about improving the international economy.

Right on, *Ottawa Citizen*. *La Presse* was equally harsh. It said:

The Turner alternative is nothing more than an unrealistic mumbo-jumbo of mercantilism and unthinking optimism.

The key to understanding the Liberal alternative is contained in the words which I quoted earlier of the Member for Montreal—Saint-Marie. He said that this was not dreamed up overnight, that it was worked out after a lot of thought and that they relied heavily on findings of various public opinion polls.

Do the people of Canada want to place their trust in a national Party that designs its trade strategy based on opinion polls instead of analysis of what exporters need to get the job done? Do you think that is what they want?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Crosbie: Are you sure?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Crosbie: Do they want to place their trust in a national Party that cooks up two alternatives in less than three months?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Crosbie: Are you sure?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Crosbie: In perfect agreement.

I have one last topic I want to address in this debate, that being the conduct of the opposition Parties in Parliament in seeking to block the free trade agreement. The NDP have obstructed the process of this House at every step. Bill C-130