

Oral Questions

assurance that as a result of his trip to Washington transboundary emission levels will be reduced at the upcoming summit?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly our hope and our expectation that transboundary emissions will be reduced as a result of actions taken by the Government of the United States and pressure brought by this Government.

I must comment that it is an unusual commentary on party discipline that the two lead questioners for the Liberal Party today were the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry and the Hon. Member for Davenport.

Mr. Riis: Keep up the statesmanlike approach, Joe.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): It is an interesting question as to who speaks for the Liberals.

Mr. Caccia: It goes to show that the Liberal Party is liberal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: Something you wouldn't understand, Joe.

Mr. Ouellet: That is why he was not Prime Minister for very long.

NEED FOR UNITED STATES COMMITMENT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, this is my supplementary question. On the eve of the third acid rain summit under the new administration of the Government elected in 1984 does the Secretary of State for External Affairs agree that unless the Prime Minister gets a commitment with respect to specific emission cuts Canada will have lost three valuable years by pursuing research instead of emission cuts?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, what it shows is that the Liberal Party is all over the lot. It is divided on the Cruise, divided on trade, and probably divided on acid rain.

Mr. Ouellet: Answer the question!

Mr. Crosbie: Where is Turner today?

Mr. Nunziata: Joe, your caucus was behind you.

Mr. Axworthy: Who lost his job, Joe?

• (1425)

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that all Hon. Members will certainly agree that the issue being raised by the Hon. Member for Davenport is a serious one on which there is a great deal of unanimity in the Chamber. I am sure that Hon. Members would wish to hear the answer of the Minister.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): In Washington I had the opportunity to speak to administration officials, and to make clear our expectation that there will be progress on the United States' side that results in a reduction in transboundary acid rain emissions. I also had the opportunity to speak to several members of both Parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives. All of them interested in acid rain, whatever their Party, unanimously made the point that the position that has been taken by the Government of Canada—particularly because under the leadership of my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, Canada has put its own house in order—is far more compelling than it was in former times. Consequently, our chances of making progress are better. We will wait and see if the Americans respond as we hope they will.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES NEGOTIATIONS—FIRST MINISTERS' MEETING

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for International Trade. The Minister has told the House that at the meeting last night no one could suggest a better way to proceed. In fact is it not true that various Premiers suggested that a subcommittee be established to work out an agreement process, and this was rejected? Therefore, will the Minister confirm that no approval process exists because of the decision of her Government to turn that proposal down flat?

Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the point that I made, and the point that I am making, is that while the subject was discussed in very reasonable tones, no one could suggest a better way to proceed than the one which we presently have of extensive consultation. There were some suggestions made by some of the Premiers, but they did not enjoy the support of other Premiers. The only system that enjoyed the support of every Premier, and every participant in the room—and I was there, the Hon. Member wasn't—was the fact that this process that we have in place of consultation, discussion, and the identification of regional and national concerns, is working. I do not understand why the NDP continues to knock a consultative process which is working, and which will produce a free trade deal that is in the interest of all Canadians in all parts of the country.

PREMIERS' POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): The Minister keeps trying to tell us that everything is proceeding wonderfully, just as in the softwood lumber case, and we know what happened there.

Will the Minister admit that last night maritime Premiers expressed grave concern about the constraints on regional development efforts, which an agreement would include, and