

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

having its problems. The Canadian people are being dished up a plate of hypocrisy and duplicity.

We debated this issue fully in the Thirty-third Parliament. I picked up a copy of an article from Vancouver's *The Province* which said:

The people want and need substantive debate. Instead they got senseless procedural wrangling from the opposition, with two recorded votes needed before leave to introduce the bill was approved.

Do you know what date that was published, Mr. Speaker? That was published on May 25, 1988. What is new? What happened this time? Members of the Opposition called for a vote on leave to introduce the Bill and they called for a vote on first reading, things which are normally done in a perfunctory way. That is what we are up against.

This issue has been debated for 64 days, 331.5 hours. Let me go through the chronology of it dating back to March 24, 1982, when the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs issued the third volume of its report entitled *Canada's Trade Relations with the United States*. Then in November of 1982, the Hon. Donald Macdonald was appointed to head a royal commission, and a lot of people overlooked that. It was a \$24 million, three-year study about economic prospects for Canada, and the commission came up with a clear conclusion. This royal commission travelled back and forth across Canada. It was made up of participants from every walk of life and every political affiliation. The participants looked at this matter in a very objective and analytical way and came up with a recommendation.

On August 13, 1983, the then International Trade Minister, Gerald Regan, responded with a document entitled *Canadian Trade Policy for the 80s*. In March of 1985 in Québec City, a meeting between the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and President Reagan resulted in a declaration on trade to seek to resolve irritants and explore possibilities for enhanced trade. In August, 1985, a special joint committee on international trade released an interim report. In August of 1985, the report of the royal commission was introduced. Since then, there has been committee study, various debates in the House, Senate debates and Senate study. Throughout it all, all we have seen from the Opposition is inconsistency, from both Liberals and New Democrats.

Even last week on December 7, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) and the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps) said they thought it was unlikely that the Party would attempt to delay the Christmas recess. The people have spoken, they said,

and whether they like it or not, to debate it between Christmas and New Year's would be folly.

● (1520)

I am glad to see my good friend from LaSalle—Émard in the House. He is a free trader. He is quoted as saying that he is a free trader. He said:

Well, Liberals are conceptually in favour of free trade. I certainly am.

I am glad he is here and I hope he might talk some sense into some people who are opposed to it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Martin: This is in free trade. This is a garbage deal and badly negotiated.

Mr. Mazankowski: I will quote another Liberal, Mr. McKenna who said:

We took the position in a calmer atmosphere with a great deal of reflection. It is not easy bucking everyone else, but we did it for the right reasons.

That is supporting the free trade deal.

Mr. Martin: If he were here he too would tell you it was a garbage deal.

Mr. Mazankowski: Senator George Van Roggen is a very distinguished Senator. He has put his money where his mouth is and called a spade a spade. He resigned and he said:

I wish to resign because I want to speak in favour of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

There is a person who has studied this thing and made it his life. In the last 10 years he has probably devoted more attention to this issue than any other single issue.

Then we have Mr. Don Johnston. If he had anything to do with the deal he would negotiate a broad free trade agreement with the United States.

What about Mr. Gerry Regan, former Minister of Trade who said:

It is economic weakness rather than strength which would undermine our future sovereignty.

My experience as Minister of Trade convinced me of two facts. The first is that given all fair conditions, able Canadian exporters can compete against anyone, anywhere.

He talked about the need for a comprehensive free trade agreement rather than the sectoral approach that was taken by the previous Government.