

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I don't see unanimous consent, neither do I hear unanimous consent. The Hon. Member is a great debater and we appreciate him very much. I must, however, recognize the Hon. Member for Humber—Port-au-Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) on debate.

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I was enjoying the speech as much as I know particular Conservative Members have, and if colleagues are willing to give unanimous consent, I will surely allow my colleague from Skeena to continue his comments and finish them with respect to the fishery.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tobin:** Is there unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. McDermid:** No. I want to hear you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Tobin:** You see what happens, Mr. Speaker. Even to discuss the economic union agreement, we already have the Hon. Member for Brampton (Mr. McDermid) doing a pale imitation of Uncle Sam by saying, "I want to hear you".

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Tobin:** Give him a stovepipe hat, the stars and stripes and let him grow a set of whiskers and we would have a real Yankee Doodle Dandy.

I hope as Members sit here this evening discussing this historic Bill, and those few Canadians who have managed to sit long enough to watch this important debate on television networks across the country will stop and remind themselves where this whole process began. It really began just about four years ago when a brand new Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), with the biggest majority in the history of Canadian politics, brand new to the job, stood up and spoke of the American protectionist sentiment that was beginning to boil and fester in Washington and of the new angry mood that was directed primarily at Japan. I can remember his words, "You can bet your bottom dollar that when the winds of protectionism blow out of Congress they won't be blowing at Canada because we have a special relationship with the United States".

That was the profound, marked in stone, etched for all time, for all Canadians to see and the beginning of our modern day discussion of our trading relationship with the United States. A brand of cocky assurance that we had no problem because we had a Prime Minister with a big majority.

**Ms. McDonald:** What about Bourassa?

**Mr. Tobin:** "We are good friends," he said. What happened? We woke up to cedar shakes and shingles because of that special relationship attitude built on the role of Butch and Spike rather than two mature nations with respect for each

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

other's boundaries. We woke up to trade action on B.C. lumber, Atlantic fish, pork, steel and other products. All of the time that trade action was being taken, Canada was giving, giving and giving some more.

• (2120)

**Mr. Benjamin:** Even on raspberries.

**Mr. Tobin:** Yes, even on raspberries. Canada was giving on investment policy long in advance of any discussion of trade. We were giving on film policy and in a dozen other areas long before any discussions on trade.

Uncle Sam understood that there was a very pliant, placid, passive Government north of the border in the Conservative administration. So the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said, "Well, I made a mistake, so the protectionist winds are blowing at us and being Mr. Nice Guy doesn't help, but don't worry, I've got a solution. We're going to negotiate free trade. When I'm finished negotiating free trade, we're going to have an exemption. U.S. trade law won't apply to Canada".

In fact, the Prime Minister told *The New York Times*, when the negotiations began, that U.S. trade law cannot apply to Canada, period. No problem. The Prime Minister set the bottom line. We have to remind ourselves of that as we look at this document tonight.

The bottom line was that we would have a relationship in which they would be free to come to our country with their products and we in Canada would be guaranteed access to their country's market with our products. That is what free trade means, is it not?

Tonight we are contemplating a Bill that enshrines in a treaty the right of the U.S. Congress forever to make existing trade law, past trade law and future trade law including retaliation measures and negative, harmful trade action against Canada apply. We have co-signed the right of the United States to take that kind of action.

The Prime Minister's bottom line, not our bottom line, not the New Democratic Party's bottom line, but the Prime Minister's bottom line was guaranteed access. What we have guaranteed in writing and have put our signature to is the right of the United States, with whatever future trade law that might be conjured up in Congress in whatever mood exists on whatever day in whatever political environment, to continue forever to take trade action against Canada. That is the bottom line.

That is the bottom line of the trade deal we have signed in exchange for a dispute mechanism. It almost sounds like "sacred trust". We have a dispute tribunal that will look at U.S. trade actions to see if they are consistent with U.S. law. The Americans can pass a new law tomorrow that is contrary to the spirit of the so-called free trade agreement.

This is not free trade, this is an economic union. The President of the United States said that we now have an