

[English]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT—BILL C-22—
STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO NEGOTIATOR

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. This morning in a speech made to a trade conference in Toronto, Simon Reisman, the chief trade negotiator, stated that on October 3, the last day of the negotiations, the Canadian negotiating team was prepared to offer Bill C-22, the drug patent Bill, as part of a concession to have Canadians exempted from Section 337 of the Trade Bill.

Will the Prime Minister admit that that is a total contradiction of the statements made by Ministers of his Government in this House under their oaths as Ministers that Bill C-22 was never part of those concessions?

Now that this statement by the chief negotiator is on the record what action will the Prime Minister take against those Ministers who made those statements? Will he confirm that in fact Bill C-22 is still part of the concessions the Government is making to the United States to get a deal?

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Is this another Axworthy special?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it has not been unknown in this House for the Hon. Member to shuffle the words before he states them. I do not accept his preamble. I categorically state again what I have said time and time before, that that which he attributes to the chief negotiator is false. We never offered any elements of C-22 or C-22 as a whole as any part of the negotiations. That has been gone through many times in this House. I stand by what is on the record of the House.

UNITED STATES OMNIBUS TRADE BILL

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister because there is now a clear contradiction between statements made by the chief negotiator and the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Give us the exact quote.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Reisman said that if Canada does not receive an exemption from the omnibus Trade Bill that the American Congress is presently considering there will be serious trouble and, in fact, there would not be a trade agreement.

Some Hon. Members: Read the quote.

Mr. Axworthy: Under those circumstances, why is the Government proceeding to sign the agreement without knowing what the results of the omnibus Trade Bill will be? Is the Government being precipitous in this case? Was Mr.

Oral Questions

Reisman stating government policy when he said that there should not be an agreement if we do not get an exemption from that omnibus Trade Bill?

Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the only contradiction that this House is hearing is that between this member of the Liberal Party and the 48 per cent of the members of the Liberal Party who support free trade.

IMPLICATIONS OF TEARING UP AGREEMENT

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission—Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Hon. Minister for International Trade. In recent days Leaders of the Liberal and New Democratic Parties have indicated that, given the chance, they would directly intervene without hesitation to destroy any previously ratified Canada-U.S. trade agreement.

As we all know, Canada has a fine tradition of honouring the commitments and agreements it formulates with the U.S. and all countries. We have achieved a very high degree of respect for doing so.

What would be the implication for Canadians—

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Hypothetical.

Mr. St. Germain: —of tearing up this historic trade agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Out of order.

Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, that is a very timely question.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss Carney: It was answered today very well by *The Globe and Mail* which pointed out that they would be tearing up the new Canada-U.S. Trade Commission to monitor trade. They would be tearing up the new binational trade courts ready to make binding decisions.

● (1500)

They would abolish the obligations of American politicians to specify Canada when they take side-swipes against the rest of the world. They would abolish and replace the group which will be writing new trade laws between the two countries. They would be reimposing high tariffs on many Canadian goods entering the United States. They would force the reimposition of all those quotas and tariffs on meat, pork and fish going into the United States. They would be turning down the \$4 billion procurement package we negotiated. They would expose the Auto Pact to the attacks of American politicians, and they would say at the end of the day that they have saved Canada.