

and punitive measures against Canada, as the import tariffs on books, the export tax on lumber, cedar shakes and shingles, the pressures on the pharmaceuticals industry with Bill C-22. The list is long, Mr. Speaker, it even includes Christmas trees. Is that long enough? Now they are talking about potash, pulp and paper, cultural industry, the Auto Pact, just to name a few. Mr. Speaker, there was a lack of seriousness in these negotiations: in the discussions the Government should have talked about such realistic things as how to implement a comprehensive agreement, an agreement which would have boosted trade between both countries. But no, they talked about other things, and I should like to remind the House that a very sobering article by Maxwell Cohen was published in weekend newspapers.

[English]

Maxwell Cohen says it very nicely:

It is difficult to understand the mind-set that led to the delay in focusing on what now appears to be the most serious obstacle to a comprehensive free trade agreement. Indeed, it is arguable that the absence of a vision of the system that was to come out of these negotiations—constitutional, administrative and adjudicative—affects not only the dispute-settlement issue but also many of the implementation and substantive questions, from agriculture to investment, to cultural/intellectual property, to services.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I could not put it any better than that. Mr. Cohen said it all.

[English]

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, not to be provocative, a lot of people can say it better than the Hon. Member. He started off his diatribe tonight by saying that the Conservatives were running around like chickens with their heads cut off. Can one imagine a federal Liberal saying today that we are running around like chickens with our heads cut off? I mean, they cannot make up their minds on the Meech Lake Accord. They cannot make up their minds on trade. They cannot make up their minds on many things. For the Hon. Member to accuse us of running around like chickens with our heads cut off is being, to be kind to him, a little exaggerated, just a little exaggerated.

I only have three minutes, unfortunately, because there were so many exaggerated, unfounded, and untrue claims in the Hon. Member's speech about so many things.

He said that the Government is attacking Canada on the lumber industry. It was the lumber industry which filed against the Canadian lumber industry; it was not the Government. It was the potash industry in the United States which filed against the potash industry in Canada. It is not the Government attacking the Government.

The Liberals have been going around spreading all these claims. They say that we sold out on shakes and shingles. They slapped a 35 per cent tariff on shakes and shingles. The federal Government, the Government of Canada, stopped shipping our cedar logs to the United States, so they are in a worse situation

Adjournment Debate

today in the United States than they ever were. The only thing they accomplished was jacking up the prices. We are still exporting our shakes and shingles down there, as we are our softwood lumber.

The Hon. Member does not have his facts right. He talked about these five principles which are the bottom line for us. Those five principles are nothing new. They were expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) right from the very start. They are nothing new at all.

He talked about our negotiators. Everyone in the United States who has anything to do with our negotiating team has said that we have the best negotiating team—the best equipped, the best informed, and the most solid negotiating team going.

When the Americans were taking us for granted, the negotiating team walked out. However, now the Americans are not taking us for granted. Now the Americans are saying: "Come on back to the table, we want to negotiate again".

Mr. Gauthier: You are crawling there on your bellies.

Mr. McDermid: We did not crawl. They called us back, and that is why they are down there today.

I will tell the Hon. Member what is going on down there today. Maybe he could understand this analogy, just maybe he could understand it. Let me use baseball because it is current right now; everybody is paying attention to baseball. We are in a rain delay right now. Does the Hon. Member understand that? We are in a rain delay right now. We have to wait for the outcome of the talks between the officials to see if the players will be asked to resume the game or go to the showers. That is what is happening right now. Those talks are going on now, and I hope they will come to—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Parliamentary Secretary just struck out.

• (1810)

ACID RAIN—POSITION OF UNITED STATES PRESIDENT— GOVERNMENT POSITION—CANADIAN MESSAGE

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, on September 18, I asked a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) regarding acid rain and what the Government is doing about Canada's number one environmental problem. I received a rather unsatisfactory and complacent response. At that time, the Minister said the following:

We have already taken a major step because we have here in this House a statement from the President of the United States on the matter of acid rain.

The American President simply reiterated a promise already made about expenditures and about taking the problem seriously, a promise he had previously broken. We are not very optimistic that it will be honoured the next time around. The President still thinks that trees cause acid rain and other kinds