

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

caused this excess capacity in labrusca grapes by our changes to the wine content, but you had better look to Ottawa if you want help and, remember, we are your friends". People are not going to buy that. Right now there are negotiations going on between the federal Government and the provincial Government to support this industry which will make it a viable, expanding and vital industry for the well-being of Ontario and Canada for years to come. I put the Ontario Government on notice. It has to do its share. It has benefited to the tune of billions of dollars from this industry over the years. It is now its turn to join with us to help make this a viable industry.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity this afternoon to speak on Motion Nos. 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25. You will know, Mr. Speaker, that those motions give a pretty broad latitude.

I would like to start with a few quotations. First, I think it is important that Canadians know the genetics of this deal. Where did it come from and what does it mean? After about August 30, the country will be inundated with taxpayer-paid advertising giving only the view of the Government and big business of the deal. Let us look back to see what the former Minister for International Trade, the present President of the Treasury Board (Ms. Carney), had to say a little while ago. This was just after the deal had been negotiated. It had taken place, of course, in Washington, not in Canada. She was interviewed by a reporter from *The Vancouver Sun*, and she is quoted as saying:

The boss has not indicated any interest in moving me, in spite of all your Ottawa rumours to the contrary. He thinks I have done a great job. As a matter of fact, he phoned me up the night we did it and said, "How does it feel to be a mother of confederation?" So I thought, gee. I have never thought of it that way. That is pretty neat.

There we have the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre, the former Minister for International Trade, the present President of the Treasury Board, receiving a call from the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) who, I suppose, was telephoning from 24 Sussex to Vancouver or Hawaii, or wherever she was at that point in time, and asking how it felt to be the mother of Confederation. That is how the Prime Minister looks at this deal and how at least one Conservative Member of Cabinet thinks of it: "Gee, I've never thought of it that way. That's pretty neat".

We hear selective quotations from the government side all the time, including from the Hon. Member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Nicholson) who just spoke about the grape industry, which will be heavily and negatively impacted both in British Columbia and Ontario by the proposed deal. Headlines read: "Economy will do well with no deal, panel says". People would not wonder who the panel is because the present Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) is always quoting selectively from the Economic Council of Canada. Here is what it had to say:

The collapse of free trade negotiations "need not be catastrophic" for the nation, the Economic Council of Canada says in its annual review to be released this week.

With 80 per cent of exports still entering the United States duty free—even without free trade—Canadians' standard of living will continue to rise, the council says.

The government side is always eager to quote selectively from the Economic Council of Canada, but there it is on record as saying that even without the deal Canada would probably be as well off, if not better; certainly from the perspective of sovereignty, we would be better off. A headline from another article in *The Globe and Mail* reads: "Free trade: a Losing Proposition". It is an article by Marjorie Cohen, author of *Free Trade and The future of Women's Work*. She teaches economics at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and represents the National Action Committee on the Status of Women in the Coalition Against Free Trade.

Mr. Mulroney's grand design to "secure" access to the U.S. market has failed. Unless Canada "harmonizes" its social and economic programs to conform to U.S. notions of what is fair play, it will have no improved access to U.S. markets. And social and economic programs are in greater danger than ever. Why? Because the economy will be tied even more closely to that of the United States, and Canada will have even more to fear from U.S. complaints if its programs aren't sufficiently similar to those south of the border.

I must point out that we cannot forget that the countervailing action taken by the U.S. against our east coast fishing industry found some 50 to 60 Canadian programs which they felt were countervailing. Of course, that is a precedent set for future countervailing actions by anyone in the United States against Canadian social programs such as unemployment insurance, the Canada Pension Plan, and medicare. Marjorie Cohen goes on to say on energy:

The free trade agreement binds Canada to more than just a pathetic disputes-settlement mechanism. It is bound to give up what is potentially the most effective weapon it has in gaining a competitive advantage with the United States: Control over energy pricing and energy supply.

This agreement has given the United States something Canada historically has resisted—total access to Canadian energy supplies. The gravity of the problem is indicated by the fact Canada has given up its ability to reserve resources for its own people even when such resources are very scarce. The agreement specifically states that, when energy is in short supply, the United States will have "proportional access to the diminished supply".

She concludes the article under the heading of "The Politics":

In his speech before Parliament last Monday, Mr. Mulroney boasted about the way his Government "brings Canadians into the decision-making process". This is political double-talk of a high order. Ordinary Canadians have not been involved in this process—it has been an initiative of big business and the Conservative Government.

The latest polls indicate that more people in Canada are against free trade than are for it. Before he was elected, Mr. Mulroney assured the country that he was against it. He said: "Don't talk to me about free trade. That issue was decided in 1911. Free trade is a danger to Canadian sovereignty. You'll hear no more of it from me".

We see what kind of a flip-flop the Prime Minister can do. He can be absolutely opposed before he is elected, but he comes into office and goes in exactly the opposite direction. We hear from the government side quotations which are never fully verified from certain people and certain groups that are