Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

The Americans subsidize more than do we. Canada is on the good end of this. If we look at the numbers we will see that we have nothing to fear. The free trade agreement makes it better for us because at least the rules of the challenge will be clearer. Sometimes debate in this House indeed clarifies things. Again I congratulate my colleague from Essex—Windsor for at last getting it straight.

(1600)

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Guelph (Mr. Winegard) has just concluded his remarks by saying there is nothing to fear on the part of Canada and Canadians in entering into the agreement which was recently signed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the President of the United States. Yet there is an extraordinary amount of fear in the communities and on the streets across this country. One of the reasons for that fear is being tested today.

Motions Nos. 39 and 93, standing in the name of the Liberal trade critic, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), are important amendments. The failure of this Government and this administration to embrace these amendments is a classic example of why Canadians are very leery about the negotiating stance taken with the Americans by our Canadian officials.

If one was to check every public poll which has been taken in the last number of years, particularly public opinion surveys which asked Canadians who received the best end of the deal, the results would unfortunately show overwhelmingly that the United States is the winner and Canadians are the losers. Motions Nos. 39 and 93 recognize whose interests we should be protecting and promoting. Clearly, we in this Parliament should be defending and promoting the interests of our own society first. When it comes to economics, we should advance the cause of our own Canadian industries in any talks we have, whether it be with the Americans or with other members of the international community.

Therefore, when we see in the American enabling legislation with respect to this trade agreement that the United States requires the U.S. trade representative to submit a report to Congress outlining the major practices in Canada which are not in conformity with the agreement, when we see Section 303 which creates the authority on the American side to have this done on an ongoing and permanent basis, and when we see that Section 303 in fact provides for regular and annual reporting and in addition requires the U.S. trade representative to undertake corrective countervailing action, we say that if the Canadian Government wants to proceed with this agreement, we either have to match the American clauses within the FDA or, if we are not going to allow the same protection to our own Canadian interests, we must negotiate with the Americans to remove it. What we are saying is that not to do either would be very irresponsible. We should not sit back while the Americans protect themselves, while the Americans try to provide that window with respect to looking

at Canadian exports and harassing Canadian exports because they are a detriment to American industry.

Do Canadians not have the right to expect their Government to include in our enabling legislation the same vehicles by which American industry can trigger their elected representatives? Of course, every Canadian expects his or her own Government to stand up for our national interests and concerns, but this Government does not. This Government is prepared to yield to the Americans. It is prepared to stand idly by while the American elected representatives put in place a mechanism whereby safeguards will be offered to their American industries which we will not have.

The Government is not willing to enter into these likeminded clauses on our own side of the trade agreement. It does not have the fortitude of its convictions to try to sit down with the Americans and make it that equal playing field to which so many government members allude.

What we are talking about is giving Canadian industries the same rights, the same mechanisms, the same opportunities that American industries were granted by the foresight of their negotiators around the negotiating table some months ago. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry moved Motions Nos. 39 and 93, to create those very like-minded clauses in our enabling legislation which would allow Canadian officials to monitor regularly U.S. policies and practices with a view to determining whether they deny benefits that should accrue to Canada and to report these findings to the Parliament of Canada. It would also permit Canadian businesses and workers to petition the trade tribunal in investigating U.S. policies and practices and allow us to get into the countervailing positions the Americans will no doubt, without any hesitation, exercise if they believe their interests are being underminded by some aspect of the trade agreement.

We are saying that the *status quo* as written in the trade agreement surrounding these particular issues is not good enough. We are asking, as we have asked repeatedly and repeatedly it has been denied for the Government to sit down again with the Americans and negotiate those areas which appear to us to be very lopsided in favour of the Americans. If the Government does not have the fortitude to sit down at the table with the American negotiators, then at the very least let us try to equalize the balance. We are not saying to tilt it in favour of Canadians.

We are not suggesting that we take the Americans to the cleaners or to be anti-American. All we are saying is that we are one of two negotiators, and the other negotiating side has seen fit to offer some safeguard whereby their American interests can be maximized in the face of their opinion about Canadian exports. What is so wrong in asking for reciprocal legislation on our side in order to equalize the balance and to send a message to the Americans that we are not going to take their aggression on any Canadian exports lying down. They have the vehicle, they have the ammunition, but so should we.