

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

It does not stop with trade, because this has been the experience in other continents where similar measures have been implemented, for example, in the case of the European Common Market. Eventually it touches on competition laws, consumer regulations, standards and the setting of standards, and this has profound implications on the environment. It touches on jobs, the jobs that will disappear, the jobs that will be enhanced, and the policies that have to be put into place in order to provide social shock absorbers to manage the transition.

There are certain things that, on the Canadian side of the border, cannot be changed and have to be dealt with in a real manner. Those are questions related to climate, wages, and volumes. Other speakers have dealt with those questions. On the question of volume, I remember very clearly a couple of weeks ago the Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) stated that south of the border the production line could be extended on a Tuesday night and enough could be produced to satisfy the needs of the Canadian market, because they have that capacity. She put it very well and very effectively. On the question of climate, our growing season is what it is. We can only produce so much between spring and fall, compared to an economy where the climate permits production of much more. Therefore, there is the capacity for producers south of the border to do much better, unless we protect our own horticultural producers, as they have told us on a number of occasions. That is a reality from which we cannot hide.

On the question of wages, again we have developed a standard of living, and social security systems. We have produced something we are very proud of, namely, our hospital and medicare systems, and our minimum wages. They do not exist in the southern part of the United States. Therefore, we will not be able to deal with that type of competition effectively, no matter how brave the exhortations might be of the Hon. Member for Crowfoot, or the Parliamentary Secretary. Those exhortations will not help in the face of such a reality.

Mr. McDermid: How do we compete with them now, for heaven's sake?

Mr. Caccia: Those who claim that the European Common Market experience is one that we should imitate, as we were encouraged to do by Mrs. Thatcher when she spoke in this Chamber, do not realize that, when it comes to negotiations at the European Common Market table, the Brits are very reluctant to go any further into an agreement for further trade facilitations. The reasons why the British can retain their sovereignty, values and identity, is because there is a channel between them and the rest of the continent, a different language, and a different history over the last 10 centuries.

That brings me to the second theme that is central in this discussion. In a short manner, I will describe it as the battle of values. On the one hand there is the dollar sign, the market-place, versus quality of life. On the one hand there is the dollar sign, and what we want to be, our identity. On the one hand there is the dollar sign versus our sense of sovereignty and decision-making powers. On the one hand there is the dollar sign, and on the other hand there are the intangible values which would take a much longer time to elaborate on which

make Canada what it is, and what makes a Canadian. In this battle of values there is a heavy emphasis on the one hand on the dollar, and on the other hand on intangible values of profound importance that have to be dealt with and put forward. This is why we are so keen to have an election called. We want to see this matter put to the people of Canada.

In this battle of values it is interesting to note that on the one hand editorialists—except for *The Toronto Star*—but most editorialists, most multinationalists, and probably most professionals are supporting the deal. In other words, those who are safe and secure and who can draw a financial benefit from this measure.

Mr. McDermid: Do not take any risks.

Mr. Caccia: I do not blame them. It is a question of values, and the Parliamentary Secretary is fully entitled to support them. However, on the other side of the population I sense that a growing number of farmers, particularly horticulturalists, and grape growers have already assessed what it will do to them. There is a growing number of food processors, and unions, because they represent the workers who will be affected in those factories whose future is at stake, which includes those in the large urban centres where shoes, textiles, and clothing are produced, and also a growing number of small businesses. There are also those, and I suspect that this number is substantial, who honestly believe that trade is not everything in life, that we can be driven and motivated by other values, not only the importance of the market-place and the size of a pay cheque.

On this side of the House others have put forward extremely well the alternative position. Because of time limitation I will only say that what we stand for, and what we do recognize, and what we recognized long before this so-called Progressive Conservative Party came into power, is the importance of international trade and that we must improve trade relations. We are fully on the same wavelength.

• (1200)

Where we disagree profoundly is how we do it. Do we do it within the confines of North America or do we do it worldwide? Do we want to improve, therefore, the trade agreements that affect 100 nations and be part of a large group of nations negotiating improvements as an alternative to a negotiation whereby, on a one-to-one basis, we negotiate with a partner that is 10 times larger and more powerful than us? That is where we profoundly disagree.

An Hon. Member: We are doing both.

Mr. Caccia: You are not doing both, because yesterday, in his speech, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) had to admit, at page 18946 of *Hansard*, that we have to get 95 other countries to agree. Well, they have not agreed, and on top of that we are implementing this measure on January 1, 1989, without waiting for the agreement and the concurrence of the international community. What a way of proceeding.