

Supply

Mr. Clarke's delivery before the standing committee, but he left out the fact that in the final analysis, Mr. Clarke, like everyone in the shake and shingle industry in British Columbia, whether cutting blocks or bolts or running saw mills, advocates and supports 100 per cent a free trade initiative with the United States of America.

I think it is important that this be brought to light. I would like the Hon. Member to comment on Mr. Clarke's position. I would also like to point out to the Hon. Member that in a forum at which I was present in Vancouver with the Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), a Mr. Bentley, who is head of Canadian Forest Products in the Province of British Columbia, clearly enunciated to the forum, to all British Columbians and to all Canadians that had we had the free trade arrangement in place, he felt there would be no 15 per cent export tax on lumber today because it would have been circumvented by that very agreement.

In conclusion, the Hon. Member cites the case of the B.C. shore workers. We are concerned about them as well. However, I think he is prejudging the situation. I have not seen the final draft, nor has he. Let us wait for the final draft on that particular issue.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, beginning with the Hon. Member's last comment about waiting until we have the final draft, the very point we are making over and over again is that the final draft has been delayed so long that the people of Canada are not going to have a chance to examine it in any kind of detail before the Prime Minister has signed away Canada's future. That is what we are concerned about.

The Hon. Member asked the question, can Canada compete? Well, I think any theory of free trade depends upon the concept of comparative advantage. Different countries will each do what they can do best. The question is, who decides what one country can do best? I believe it is the responsibility of the Government of a country to have some say over the economy of that country and to help to shape that economy.

Mr. St. Germain: That is socialism in its extreme form.

Mr. Manly: That is not socialism. That is the sort of thing that is happening in Japan. That is what Sir John A. Macdonald wanted to do. He felt there should be a national policy. If that is socialism, we will baptize Sir John A. Macdonald and take him over here into the New Democratic Party and the Conservatives can forswear him. They have already forsworn his heritage of Canadianism. If the Hon. Member wants to say that Sir John A. Macdonald's policy is socialism, he can go ahead.

The problem with this trade agreement is that we are giving away our ability to shape our own economy. We are giving away our control over our energy resources. We are giving away our control over our fisheries resources. We are surrendering the comparative advantage that would allow the Government to make basic decisions about the strengths of this country. If we surrender everything in advance, as this

Government has done with the Americans, it is going to be very difficult to compete. If we are going to make all the concessions in advance, we are not going to be able to compete.

Finally, the Hon. Member commented on my statements regarding Mr. Clarke. I have made it very clear that Mr. Clarke was a witness who was in favour of the trade agreement. If the Hon. Member checks my remarks, I think he will find that. As for Mr. Bentley, the Head of Canadian Forest Products, I worked for him as head of Canadian Forest Products a few years ago. I did not have any great regard for the kind of attitude he had towards his workers.

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Champlain (Mr. Champagne).

Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for External Relations): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in a debate that is so important because we are talking about the question of free trade and the history-making agreement that has just been concluded by our Government and the United States. It is perhaps not so important if we consider the substance of the motion presented by the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, from the very beginning the New Democratic Party systematically opposed a free trade agreement with the Americans, without even knowing what the Agreement contained or the whys and wherefores. It was simply because their union leader, a Mr. Bob White, had said they were not going to support it. It was mainly because Mr. Bob White, who happens to be a personal friend of Mr. Broadbent, decided that free trade would not be a good thing for Canadians. They conveniently forgot one thing, Mr. Speaker. The Auto Pact is probably the best example of free trade with the Americans we did not have to sell in Canada, and it has been of particular benefit to the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), although he doesn't mention that, Mr. Speaker. He is not rising in the House to say there has already been a kind of free trade agreement with the Americans. When I hear NDP Members deny it is a free trade agreement when automobile parts circulate freely without tariff barriers, I wonder what it is, Mr. Speaker.

Before going any further, I would like to let Canadians who are listening know what the Opposition Parties are and what they stand for. I have some quotes I intend to use. I am quoting from *Hansard* of February 24, 1972, when the former Minister of Finance, today the Leader of the Official Opposition and Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Turner), said:

The division of the world into large trading blocs, to which I referred a few moments ago, presents particular dangers to Canada as a major trading nation and one of the few industrialized countries without free access to a market of 100 million people or more.

We in this country must now use what influence we can bring to bear to press for a resumption of the postwar movement toward greater liberalization of international trade. The dangerous alternative would be a move backward