

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Mr. Caccia: Madam Speaker, I thank the Parliamentary Secretary for having revealed the source of the statements, otherwise I would not have recognized them.

Mr. Kempling: He would not have read that either.

Mr. Caccia: Those statements remind me of other parts in the same report which I would like to quote in reply to the Parliamentary Secretary because I find them rather peculiar, to say the least, when the same Macdonald Commission reported in an attempt to forecast what would happen:

"Until these barriers are gone—"

And by these barriers the reference is made to trade barriers of course,

"—the exhilaration that can come from a true sense of maturity will remain beyond our nation's reach."

That statement is in the same league as the ones which the Parliamentary Secretary quoted. It is rhetoric of some sort. That was the reason the Government was spooked by fear of U.S. retaliation, went to Washington, asked for access to the U.S. market and did not get it. Not only that, but the Government provoked a round of legislative initiatives, including the U.S. omnibus bill, which has made the situation for Canada tougher than it was before.

On the question of maturity and exhilaration, it is interesting and worth while to put on record what Mavor Moore wrote over the weekend as reported in *The Globe and Mail*. He analysed the situation so beautifully it would be a pity to miss it. I hope the Parliamentary Secretary can understand and appreciate the refinement of Mavor Moore's thought. He wrote:

"Maturity may or may not be assisted by free trade; history gives no assurance either way. The one sure key to maturity is knowing who you are, and universal experience advises us not to lose it inadvertently, or to sell it at any price."

My answer to the Parliamentary Secretary is that I do not want to sell it at any price, nor would I like to see Canada's independence sold at any price—

Mr. McDermid: It was not.

Mr. Caccia:—nor Canada's identity sold at any price.

Mr. McDermid: It was not.

Mr. Caccia:—nor Canada's sovereignty sold at any price.

Mr. McDermid: It was not.

Mr. Caccia: Therefore, for all these reasons we will put to the Canadian people the importance of defeating this Government in order to defeat this measure.

Mr. Hockin: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question that pertains to the thrust of his remarks, particularly his comments about independence and sovereignty.

Does the Hon. Member not understand that the American ability to sideswipe Canada when the Americans take trade remedy actions against other countries has been removed through this agreement? We now have protected ourselves against sideswipes.

Second, does the Hon. Member not agree that the binational panel which deals with trade remedies puts us in a situation of equality with the superpower? Does the Hon. Member not agree, with the United States being ten times bigger than Canada, that right now when we have a dispute we have to go cap in hand and ask the Americans to be nice to us or fight in their court system? Does the Hon. Member not agree that the binational panel institutionalizes equality for Canada with the United States and that this is an enormous step forward for sovereignty?

Finally, all the studies indicate that securing access to and having liberalized trade with the United States will produce more jobs and more wealth for Canada. Does that not allow us to fund our cultural and other groups that help us to promote our culture in the sense of our cultural well-being?

Mr. Caccia: Madam Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Minister of State for whom I have the highest regard, if what he said were correct, why was it necessary yesterday morning in this House for the Minister for International Trade to say, as reported at page 18946 of *Hansard* the following:

"We want to achieve a clear set of rules for countervail that prevents the kind of politicized decision-making we saw in the U.S. in the softwood lumber case."

That is still to be achieved. It is not yet in the bag. That is not yet resolved. We have not achieved equality with the superpower in this. We still have to obtain it. Both of us have seven years to develop the question of resolving our own disputes and defining the question of subsidies. Subsidy has been left in limbo. I am sorry for the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) because he is making a statement of hopeful anticipation, perhaps, which even his own colleague, the Minister for International Trade was prompted yesterday to put in terms of things still to happen, not that have happened, otherwise the Minister for International Trade would not have gone on by saying:

If the Americans suggest, sometime in the next five to seven years, some kind of distorted approach to those issues, we will simply say no. We will not agree to their suggestions. That is all we have to do, just say no.

What will happen when we say no to the future seven years from now? Will we pull out of the deal after having put into motion phenomenal machinery of integration of the two systems and harmonization of regulations? That will be pretty hard to do at that late stage. There are many unresolved questions, Madam Speaker, otherwise the Minister for International Trade yesterday would not have raised them himself in his own speech.