

The Americans have a clear agenda. They know what they want. They come out in the open with what they want. They have said categorically, from the President to the United States trade representative to the senior Senator in the finance committee of the United States, that they want to eliminate any other programs which their companies consider unfair subsidies. That is what they have said, in black and white.

In the past they have claimed under their legislation—and it is perpetuated under the agreement—of 1930 and 1974, and the overwhelmingly broad definitions in the omnibus Bill just passed by the Congress that dozens of our regional development programs and social programs constituted unfair subsidies. Are we so naive to think that the Americans will change their minds?

[*Translation*]

Let us not kid ourselves, the next round of negotiations will be even more difficult than what we have experienced so far. Discussions over a five-to-seven year period will have to do with the definition of a subsidy. What is or is not a subsidy? This has now become the number one question. I do not believe the Government is fully aware of what is at stake. And quite frankly, although I already had very serious reservations about the ability of our Prime Minister to stand his ground before American pressure, I must confess that I am now ten times more worried. My concern has grown ever deeper as the days go by, for clearly the Government has not yet managed to stand up once to the Americans. This Government has kept on yielding to American pressure, totally and without any scruple whatever. Whether we are talking about lumber, foreign investment, prescription drugs, acid rain, our sovereignty in the Arctic, the President or Congress say "Jump!" and this Government slavishly asks "Where do you want me to jump?" That is the sad story we have lived through over the past four years, and I have every reason to believe that it is also the sad story we can expect to live through over the next four years.

In the course of the election campaign the Government solemnly promised that our social programs and our regional development programs will never be on the negotiation table. But the Government never did tell us what is negotiable, what are the parameters of negotiations concerning subsidies. Yes or no, are our social programs, our cultural programs, and our regional development programs open for negotiations?

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

This, Mr. Speaker, is a bad contract. It is an unbalanced agreement. It gives Americans control over our economic levers. And when a nation has lost control over its economic levers, the political levers cannot be far behind. History has proved that a number of times. That is why we in this Party will continue our fight.

Most Canadian men and women fully realize that this is a bad agreement, which explains their massive vote against the agreement and against the Government. As a matter of fact, 57 per cent of Canadians did not vote for this Government nor for the Free Trade Agreement with the United States.

• (1720)

[*English*]

I have said that the Government won a majority of the seats. The Government has the right to govern. The Government has the right to proceed with its legislative agenda. But we on this side of the House have the right, and indeed the duty, to show how the deal will hurt Canadians. That is the essence of the Canadian parliamentary system.

Last summer I asked Liberal Senators to delay consideration of the trade legislation until the people had the opportunity to consider it in an election. As I said on July 20, 1988—and the Minister has quoted only part of that declaration—if a majority of MPs in a new Parliament want the trade agreement to become law, after debate the Senate should pass the Bill quickly. I stand by what I said, and that will happen.

What has happened during this week has not been the fault of the Opposition and cannot be laid at the hands of this side of the House. We have seen the most heavy-handed, ham-handed manipulation or attempted manipulation of the House, and the mismanagement of the House.

Our House Leader and Whip had to suggest to the House Leader on the government side how to bail himself out of an impasse. We were ready to debate this on Tuesday morning, Mr. Speaker, and you know it. We are ready to debate it at any time. We will not waste the time of the House. We will put our arguments, we will put our amendments, and we will allow these votes to be taken. But we are damned if we are going to be manoeuvred by a majority that thinks it is a game, a tyranny, and has not recognized the deep lack of consensus in this country, and the concern of millions of Canadians that their jobs and their futures are at risk under this agreement.