

United States. We are moving to eliminate that and provide for a more honest situation with respect to this agreement.

Motion No. 8 has been grouped with Motions Nos. 5 and 6. Those motions would eliminate Clause 6 of the Bill which allows the federal Government to intervene into provincial areas of jurisdiction in order that the federal Government can implement this agreement and this Bill despite the feelings of provincial Governments.

The Conservative Government came to power boasting that it was going to improve federal-provincial relations. As a matter of fact, in some areas it has made some headway. It has put a clause in this Bill which will allow the federal Government to run rough-shod over provincial jurisdiction to implement the terms of this agreement and the terms of this Bill.

Unfortunately, not enough provincial Governments have given serious enough attention to this issue, particularly the long-term effect of a clause such as this. When the Bill was first tabled several provincial Governments, including those provincial Governments in favour of the agreement, were extremely upset with this clause and indicated that they were going to attack it in the courts.

We are moving that this clause be struck from the Bill. We hope that good sense will prevail and the Government will finally take this clause out of the Bill as it finally took out Clause 8. For weeks we stated that the original Clause 8 was wrong and that it gave powers that should never be given in Canada. Finally, the Minister, after denying those accusations for weeks withdrew that clause. Let us hope that he sees good sense and also withdraws Clause 6.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak on Motions Nos. 5, 6, and 8 which have been grouped for debate this evening. As some Members know, Motion No. 5 aims to delete Clause 3 which sets out the broad purpose of the Bill. Motion No. 6 will delete Clause 4 which makes the Bill binding on Canada. Motion No. 8 will delete Clause 6 which is the clause that gives the federal Government the right to pass laws implementing various parts of the agreement.

In dealing with these rather broad motions and the clauses to which they apply, one cannot overlook recent Canadian history and how we got to where we are today. We cannot forget that, a scant four years ago, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) took the opportunity to tell Canadians that he was flatly opposed to a free trade agreement with the United States and would never—

Mr. McDermid: It's over five years ago.

Mr. Fulton: I am corrected from across the floor, between four and five years ago he was flatly opposed, and there was no attempt by the Prime Minister, or by anyone sitting on the front benches, to push for a so-called free trade agreement with the United States during the last election campaign.

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

We must ask where this thing came from. I represent a constituency that is more than one-quarter of British Columbia. I campaigned when there was a Conservative running in that seat, there was the *PC Campaign Handbook*, all types of information was available, and journalists came through the constituency. No one in my constituency from Prince Rupert, the Queen Charlottes, Terrace, Kitimat, Smithers, Hazelton, Atlin, or Telegraph Creek came to me, the Tory candidate, the Liberal candidate, or the media and said: "We need some type of broad, far-reaching trade agreement with the United States".

I have asked my colleagues, the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis), the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), and Members from around the House, and I have not been able to find any Member in the House who was promoting a free trade agreement with the United States during the 1984 campaign. We must ask ourselves: "Where did this come from?" I look up to the gallery. Did anyone in the gallery hear of a free trade agreement while the campaign was going on? One person in the whole gallery heard about the free trade agreement during the 1984 election campaign. Therefore, we must ask ourselves: "Where did it come from?" We find our first clue when we look and see who Mr. Mulroney asked to be the negotiator.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Papproski): Order, please. The Hon. Member knows that it is the Prime Minister, or the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, and he should call him the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Fulton: Where has the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) been in this debate? This is the most fundamental and most important part of an election campaign and the Prime Minister is nowhere to be seen. As we were reminded only last Friday, the Prime Minister gave his maiden speech on a Bill in Parliament, four years into a Parliament. That is a preposterous state of affairs.

Let us do a little more investigation. Who is selling the free trade deal? The Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). Let us scamper back into history. When Newfoundland was joining Canada, although this happened just before I was born, but I studied it in school, the Crosbie family was trying to lead Newfoundlanders into joining the United States rather than Canada. They all wore black arm bands on the day Newfoundland joined Canada rather than joining the United States. Here we have a little piece of history pulling itself together. We have the same person, the Minister for International Trade, flying across Canada. This is the fellow who has not read the deal. Everyone in the gallery knows that. He used to sell encyclopaedias. He didn't read them either. He used to sell vacuum cleaners and couldn't make them run. He was trying to read the instructions.

• (2110)

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!