

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Crofton):** I regret that the Minister's time has expired for questions and answers. I recognize the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) on debate.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When are we going to stop one Member from getting up and talking, talking and talking, not even concerning things the Minister asked about, so as to stop someone else from asking questions? That is not the purpose of our question and comment period at all. One person should not be able to monopolize it as was done a few minutes ago.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Crofton):** The Hon. Member for Trinity.

**Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity):** Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of this debate I just want to put a few remarks on the record. It is regrettable that the Government has decided to hurry this Bill through the House. This is a most important Bill. It amends about 27 Acts of Parliament. The Government has used closure all the way. There has been a total of 12 days of debate on the Bill. The period for committee hearings was short. Many people who wanted to give evidence were not heard from, and all the hearings were in Ottawa; there was no attempt to travel outside Ottawa. It is a very sketchy and superficial examination of an important piece of legislation which could change and affect the whole future of Canada.

This is billed as a trade agreement, but it goes far beyond a trade agreement in the sense that there is potential here to affect the whole conduct of Canadian economic and political life. In fact, as a trade agreement it does not do what the Government promised. The agreement was supposed to give Canada secure access to the American market. It does not do that, but it does put our sovereignty and our capacity to take independent action in our own best interests in jeopardy.

We on this side of the House oppose the deal, not because we are anti-American or because we are protectionists. On the contrary, we share with our American friends the longest undefended boundary in the world. The Americans are our allies and our most important trading partner. Liberals have always been in favour of liberalized trade, but Canada by virtue of our smaller economy has always been vulnerable to trade harassment by the United States. Over the years we have negotiated successfully through international fora rather than going head-to-head with our great neighbour.

The reasons for this are obvious. Apart from the disparity in size of the U.S. economy and population, which is ten times as large as ours, in a bilateral agreement we are the petitioners. We are the people looking for access to the American market. When we go to the GATT or international fora we are petitioners. The Americans are petitioners. All the economies of the world are petitioners. Everybody is trying to get a better deal. Not everyone gets what is first requested, but hopefully there is some kind of consensus with which we can all live. Canada has done well negotiating in the international fora. As a matter of fact at the time the Conservative Government

### *Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

started work on this trade deal some 85 per cent of our goods were already moving across the American border without tariff, with a further 10 per cent in the process of being phased out under the GATT.

Instead of negotiating within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Conservative Government chose to put its eggs in the basket of a bilateral agreement. It failed to get the secure access to the American market that was promised. It would have been no disgrace to say "we tried, we failed" and then walk away, but not this Government. It had to have a deal at any price. What it has negotiated is the most massive giveaway of our sovereignty in history.

During the negotiations we were told time and time again that the Government would negotiate free access, secure access to the U.S. market. During the negotiations which also were conducted in secret, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) vowed that he would accept nothing less than total exemption for Canada from the application of U.S. countervail and anti-dumping laws.

**Mr. McDermid:** Where is that quote?

**Miss Nicholson (Trinity):** The Hon. Member asks for a quote. I will be very pleased to give it to him, Mr. Speaker. In an interview with representatives of *The Wall Street Journal*, on April 3, 1987, the Prime Minister said:

"The United States trade remedy laws cannot apply to Canada."

In March, 1987, the then Minister for International Trade said that the objective of any trade agreement would be the elimination of countervail by both countries. Curiously, in the House of Commons during the last sittings of Parliament in 1987, she said that this was never her objective. The present Minister said, in a speech in St. John's, that he expected the agreement to provide for the elimination of countervail.

• (1930)

Secure access would mean that Canada would be exempt from American trade law, and that has not happened. We are not exempt from the 1930 U.S. Trade Act or the 1974 Trade Act. We are not exempt from the omnibus trade Bill recently passed by the U.S. Government.

There is to be a new trade tribunal, but it will not protect our export markets because it will not be able to challenge existing American trade laws. It will only be able to interpret American trade laws. Article 1902(1) of this agreement says that the U.S. reserves the right to apply its anti-dumping law and countervailing duty law to goods imported from the territory of the other party, that is, Canada. The Government failed to get an agreement to benefit Canada. Instead it took a deal at any price. It lacked the courage to walk away and admit the failure.

This deal has sold out many Canadian interests. In particular, I would like to draw attention to the sell-out of financial services because the deal provides much better benefits to the U.S. than it does to Canada. With the exception of granting