

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, even that Member knows that that is not a point of order. However, I had to get that on the record because as events unfold we will watch the Liberal Party abandon the position taken by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg South Centre, abandon the position taken by its current Leader, and shift to the big business orientation it temporarily left during this campaign.

Who will lead that shift? Other Liberals. Mr. Bourassa, Premier of the Province of Quebec and a Liberal, is a strong supporter of free trade. Other Liberal Premiers are supporters of free trade.

Ms. Copps: Why don't you stick to the free trade deal if you really care about it?

Mr. Barrett: Have we heard one word of condemnation of those Liberal leaders from the Liberal Party? Not a peep. Not a sound. Not a whimper. Nothing except constant chatter from a bird in the background who is obviously distraught by this analysis.

Ms. Copps: Fight the real fight.

Mr. Barrett: In spite of that chatter, the Liberal Party is playing politics on this issue at the provincial level on one stage, and at the federal level on another stage. I find that more hypocritical than what the Government is doing.

Having said that, I want to go on to a continuing story of hypocrisy. Let us deal with the hard, tough words of the Government when it comes to the Free Trade Agreement and let us focus on the history of the shakes and shingles countervailing duty issue.

Earlier this spring, when the countervailing duty was imposed on shakes and shingles, we were going to have a demonstration of how tough and how aggressive the Government would be when that great big American colossus would stamp its foot down on poor little Canada. Do not worry, folks, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and his Cabinet would fight back. I refer you to page 13559 of *Hansard*, May 23, 1986:

EDWARD BROADBENT (OSHAWA): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It goes back to the incredible decision made by President Reagan himself to sacrifice some 4000 jobs in British Columbia as a result of an unfair duty imposed by the President himself. Considering that the du-

Canada—U.S. Free Trade Agreement

ty had nothing to do with unfair trade practices and that it was imposed by the President himself, and having nothing to do with Congress, is the President not sending a clear message to the Prime Minister, namely, where Americans cannot compete with Canadians, then Canadians will not be allowed by the Americans to have access to their market?

This is the reply of the Prime Minister.

RIGHT HON. BRIAN MULRONEY (PRIME MINISTER): Mr. Speaker, I would not disagree with that construction.

That was an admission by the Prime Minister that in the case of shakes and shingles, where Canadians could compete and beat the Americans, the Americans moved in with a countervailing duty and said, "If you beat us that way, we are going to hammer you with a countervailing duty".

The questioning went on. There was a question as to whether or not the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) phoned the President or Mr. Shultz, the Secretary of State. There appeared to be some ambiguity about whether or not anyone had been phoned, but nonetheless, as reported on page 13560, the Prime Minister said:

The Secretary of State for External Affairs spoke directly with Secretary Shultz. We have conveyed our views, and we will be doing so again. We hope that we will be able to take some actions ourselves.

What action? Was it a sneeze? Was it a whimper? Was it a letter saying: "Naughty, naughty"?

• (1250)

I will quote further from the same page, Mr. Speaker, to make the point. The Prime Minister went on to say:

We believe that freer trade will bring about greater economic opportunities, which is why we will resist this type of protectionism. We will try to prepare an appropriate response for the American administration which will convince them of the folly of this kind of action directed either against a great friend such as Canada or anyone else. This kind of thing is bad news.

That was said in May of 1988.

Within the last month the United States, through its President, continued its countervail on shakes and shingles. But it was after the election. There has been no comment from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. There has been no comment from the Prime Minister. They did not phone Mr. Shultz. They did not phone the President. They did not phone the water boy. They just rolled over and played dead.

Once the election was over and the Prime Minister was confronted with the very thing he said his campaign