

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

way the rights, the duties and the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. We would apply certificates to the import question.

There is a whole series of amendments relating to agriculture. How was that important, Madam Speaker? First, agriculture was never supposed to have been on the table. Again the Macdonald Royal Commission said it should not be. Once again, the Macdonald Royal Commission, the bible of the trade agreement, clearly said that agriculture should be exempted because agriculture was not just a commercial enterprise. It was so mixed up in the social fabric of this country, in the stability of our rural economy, in the sense of the family farm and the kind of small town community life that to apply pure commercial criteria to it would be a serious mistake. But the Government did not listen to that. It went ahead and did it.

Now the Government has put in jeopardy a whole range of issues. If you think I am kidding, Madam Speaker, you only have to go back to the words of the Minister for International Trade today or to the GATT meetings in Montreal last week. What did he say? He said that the Western Grain Transportation Agreement, perhaps the most important subsidy to western Canadian farmers, is now on the negotiating table. He is prepared to wipe it out. He is prepared to negotiate it away. He does not care. That is part of the commercial judgment.

He does not understand, even though he is a former Minister of Transport, how essential that is to the continuation of a certain way of life in western Canada, to say nothing of our grain economy. Because the Government has committed itself in an agreement very explicitly to follow without hesitation the line of thinking and the ideology of the United States in this area, it has committed itself to wholesale attack on a large number of programs that provide real stability in our agricultural sector.

Members opposite may protest that, but I say to them, "don't protest. Accept the amendments". That is all they have to do. They can show good faith. Accept these amendments and we know that the Government will be able to live up to its word. We will not argue. All the Government has to say is, "Okay, those amendments are once again reflective of commitments that were made during the campaign". Is it not interesting that what was said up to November 21 has been quickly forgotten in late December? All those fine protestations seemed to have vanished like the winter wind. We know the reason. There is an agenda for a wholesale attack on

these programs. One by one they will be picked off; first the cherry plum pickers. Off they go, one by one.

I go back to the point I made earlier. Where can Canadians find out? Who will they be able to talk to about these secret negotiations that are going on, negotiations on services, on subsidies and on technical standards? These are all things that my friend the Hon. Member for Kent (Mr. Crawford) spoke to last night in a very effective way. Because this Parliament has not been given any right to consider it, once again we are being denied those privileges.

I have a few more examples, Madam Speaker. One, I think, is absolutely crucial, and that is the role of the Canadian International Trade Tribunal. That will become a very important agency in this Government. It will be responsible for undertaking all the various action disputes between ourselves and the United States. One of the real fantasies perpetrated during the campaign was the concept of secure access. I read all those documents from the Business Alliance and from the Canadian multicorporate conglomeration for the preservation of corporate culture in Canada, whatever it was that was spending all that money on newspaper ads. What was the headline? "John Turner is lying, the Liberals are lying. This is a great agreement because it gives security of access to Canadians".

**An Hon. Member:** The Minister said the opposite.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Now who is lying? We had the Minister in the House this morning admit that there is no security of access. In fact, U.S. trade law will still apply. U.S. trade organizations will still have the right to countervail, to take action. All we have is a puny, minor, miniscule little review agency which is simply going to do the job that is already being done by the International Court of Trade.

In return for that Rube Goldberg machine that was introduced by this Government as part of the agreement, what did we give up? Access to the GATT to challenge U.S. trade law. We gave up perhaps the most important protection for Canadians, one that we would not simply have the right to challenge whether the law was fairly applied. We have given up the right to challenge U.S. trade law itself. Is that what this Government calls secure access? Let me give some mechanics. Under this review mechanism the U.S. industry will have enhanced powers to attack Canadian industry. The omnibus Trade Bill gives the Americans the right to petition the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government will do all the