

*Extension of Sittings*

The debate in the election and before, both in this House and out in the countryside was simply yes or no. Do we want this deal or not? The debate now is still yes or no, but it is also how and under what conditions and how best to protect Canadians from the effects of this deal. That debate has not yet been held. That is just one more reason why the Government's arrogant attempt to impose new, reprehensible and unjustified rules and procedures in this debate is wrong.

This is legislation by exhaustion and an attempt to achieve annexation by exhaustion or, if you choose, absorption by attrition. That is not what an assembly of supposed intelligent debate ought to be about.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Mission—Coquitlam (Ms. Langan), mentioned just a few moments ago that those new Members in this House who have not had the dubious distinction or pleasure of having been here or of having visited this place before in an official capacity and find themselves in some consternation attempting to learn the rules in a few very short days. It is one thing to want to learn the rules, but when you have a government that insists on changing the rules to meet its whim—and that is what it is, a whim—it is wrong because there is no compulsion upon the Government to have this agreement passed through all stages by January 1, 1989, and the Government knows it.

The Government says that its credibility is at stake. It said: "We have told our American brothers that we would have this thing signed, sealed, and all wrapped up by January 1, 1989". But our friends from the republic to the south have already said that they are quite willing to extend that time. There is nothing hard and fast about it. The Americans certainly perceive it to be in their interests that this agreement ought to be concluded. Obviously the Government thinks that it is in our nation's interest, rightly or wrongly. But there is no need to rush this matter through and deny this House the opportunity to make careful examination of the provisions of the enabling legislation, particularly in view of the fact that the Government made quick, last minute changes to that enabling legislation the first time it was brought into this House at third reading.

Obviously the Government had not given good thought to it at that time, but the Tories found out after they had almost got the Bill through the House of Commons that they had made a serious mistake. They

finally decided to delete the section which originally indicated that the Free Trade Agreement would take precedence over all Canadian law. They thought that was a mistake either for good, sound reasons or simply for sound political reasons.

We are not going to have time to review this carefully in the limited time the Government is giving us. By sitting all hours of the night, and very soon on a very limited and closed, set timetable, we will not be able to give adequate attention to the detailed provisions of this enabling legislation. Is it still the same, or has the Government made more changes? We do not know yet. Perhaps the Government does not know yet either. It did not last time. Does it?

Mr. Clayton Yeutter played a very key and vital part in selling the American case during the negotiations between the U.S. and Canada on this deal. In the *Vancouver Province* for Thursday, November 17, 1988, at page 17 we read:

"The U.S. could introduce tough new laws against imports from Canada—even if the free trade deal were in effect and the Canada-U.S. panel found them contrary to the agreement.

That suggestion was made in a letter written by President Ronald Reagan's top trade official, Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter.

In the letter, to U.S. Senator Dennis DeConcini, Yeutter spells out the wide latitude the U.S. would retain under the trade deal to penalize imports from Canada.

Canada would have similar powers. The letter was written March 28 but was unpublicized. A copy was provided to the *Toronto Star*.

Yeutter's assertion appears to contradict claims by Prime Minister . . . and business supporters of the proposed deal that Canada has made a major gain in circumventing U.S. trade laws.

Yeutter notes in his letter that, under the trade deal, the U.S. will continue to apply its trade laws against Canada. "We will also retain the ability to amend our countervailing duty law and to apply this amended law to Canada," he says.

Those laws permit U.S. agencies to impose countervailing duties and other penalties on Canadian imports that are taking markets away from American companies."

That item did not receive any publicity at all in this country until four days before Canadians went to the polls. Mr. Yeutter's comment in his letter of some months earlier, which was only released for public consumption in late November, very clearly stated that all that the opposition Parties, whether they be New Democrat or Liberal, had been saying during the course of the election campaign was true, that this trade agreement did not guarantee us any access at all.