

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

**Mr. McDermid:** You will never know.

**Mr. Blaikie:** The Parliamentary Secretary says that we will never know. I would be very surprised. He spent the evening heckling people who spoke in favour of these amendments. Surely if the Government were going to accept these amendments then we might have expected a little more courtesy from the other side than we have received.

**Mr. McDermid:** Just keeping you honest, Bill.

**Mr. Blaikie:** What are these amendments, Mr. Speaker? They are amendments that have to do with aboriginal land claims, that would provide that the deal does not affect the special relationship that aboriginal peoples have with the Crown and the federal Government. It seems to me to be a reasonable amendment, not only in terms of the logic of the Government's arguments with respect to amendments, but also with respect to the fact that the Government, in my judgment and in the judgment of aboriginal peoples, has no right to enter into a treaty with another nation that would abrogate rights which they have by virtue of their treaties with the Crown. Surely we would want to make that absolutely clear. Surely it would be an elemental principle of justice in terms of the relationship between native peoples and the Canadian Government that we would want to see enshrined in the legislation implementing the free trade agreement.

Another amendment has to do with the whole question of environmental or conservation programs. If the Government insists, as it does, that this amendment does not affect environmental or conservation programs, what on earth could be wrong with an amendment that says so? What could be wrong with an amendment that makes explicit what the Government itself argues is already the case, unless what the Government argues is the case is a matter of interpretation, or a matter of trying to sell the agreement politically when the Government knows full well that many of these types of programs could come to be the object of negotiation between Canada and the United States.

**Mr. McDermid:** It is protected under the GATT. It is in the GATT and these are GATT rules.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary is foaming at the mouth again.

**Mr. McDermid:** It is already there.

**Mr. Blaikie:** If it is already in the GATT why not reinforce it by having it in this agreement? I do not see any problem with that, but obviously the Government does because it does not want to offend what the United States obviously understands to be a different interpretation than what the Government is attempting to lead the Canadian people to believe with respect to this agreement.

Motion No. 11 states that the deal does not stop the establishment of special adjustment programs to help victims

of the deal. There is confusion on this. At one point the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that there would be massive adjustment programs. Then almost the next day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) stated that this would be handled by ordinary adjustment programs, programs that are already in place. One begins to wonder whether the massive adjustment programs talked about by the Prime Minister, and it is interesting that he thinks there will have to be massive adjustment programs, are actually possible within the agreement, or whether they would not violate the spirit of the agreement itself. The agreement states: "Let the market-place decide". We over here state: "Let the people decide", but over there they say: "Let the market-place decide". If the market-place decides, a great many people will lose the jobs they now have. That is what the agreement states. Perhaps that is why the Government will not accept this amendment that would make it clear that adjustment programs are permissible within the context of the agreement.

Another amendment that the Government refuses to accept has to do with making it clear that regional development programs are not affected by the deal. How many times have we risen in the House and asked the Government about the effect of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement on regional development programs and government Members have stood there, full of sound and fury signifying nothing and stating that the agreement does not affect regional development programs? If it does not affect regional development programs, what on earth is wrong with an amendment that explicitly states that this legislation and the agreement which it implements do not affect regional development programs?

Finally, with respect to the whole question of social programs, the sleeper in this agreement, and it is too bad that not very many Canadians understand as yet what I call the "sleeper" in this agreement, is the commitment to negotiate over the next five to seven years what constitutes an unfair trade practice and what constitutes a direct subsidy. This is a real danger in this agreement. It is in that process, a process which has yet to unfold, and a process which can only be judged in terms of the negotiations which have gone on so far, and in which negotiations Canada has emerged as the loser, that we will lose the social programs that we have now.

The Parliamentary Secretary and others say that this is hysteria and fearmongering, but there is a logic to this fear. One is only paranoid when he or she is afraid of something that is not there. We are trying to say that there is a real danger to Canadian social programs as a result of the commitment to negotiate over the next five to seven years what constitutes an unfair trade practice. There was plenty of testimony before the Standing Committee on External Affairs