

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

was none other than the Leader of the Conservative Party, the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker, who attacked the Auto Pact day after day in the House of Commons.

On the contrary, with respect to our Party, our Party put its position with respect to the Auto Pact in terms of two things. First, we said that there should be commitments with respect to investment in the future and there should be commitments in the form of letters which the companies actually give to the Government as commitments. Second, we said that if there is to be a trade change like this, there has to be in place an assistance program for workers who will be affected, a lesson which the Conservatives have still not learned. That is why the Transitional Assistance Benefits Program was brought in. As soon as it was in place and as soon as the commitments to investment in the country were in place, as the Hon. Member should know, both the New Democratic Party and the labour unions involved, as well as the parts producers involved, became supporters of an agreement which, because it had safeguards, because it had support for workers who were affected, was at that stage a fair agreement, unlike this agreement.

**Mr. Malone:** Madam Speaker, if there is anything that I have heard in what the Hon. Member has just asked in the way of a question that would give me reason to suggest that there is a significant difference between us and how we see Canada, it is his requirement that there be commitments and safeguards.

Last night, when I was having a bite to eat, I wrote out on my napkin, a very fast scratching, the areas in which I believe Canada is the best in the world—certainly better than the United States. We produce better beef. Americans will not like to hear that but we do. We also do it cheaper. We produce better pork in Canada. We have a better labour force in Canada. We are far better in telecommunications and telecommunications research. We have by far better oil field technology, which is why producers in the North Sea and the Middle East come to Calgary and not to Houston.

While I could go on with this list I see that Madam Speaker is encouraging me to hurry. Let me just say that there are some other areas in which we are the best in the world. We do not need safeguards and guarantees. We need markets. Give us the markets and Canada will show the world that we are people who can produce and create jobs and wealth because we do not need safeguards. We need opportunity. That is what this agreement with the United States is all about.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member. However, the period for questions and comments has now expired.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe Your Honour was in the chair yesterday when a matter raised by the Parliamentary Secretary came up with respect to the Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) and his use of unparliamentary language concerning the Prime

Minister (Mr. Mulroney). There was reference to the “blues”. I would ask Your Honour to look at page 18974 of *Hansard* where, about half way down the page, the Hon. Member for York South—Weston is reported clearly to have used unparliamentary language. The Hon. Member is not in the House. However, I would ask the Chair to make a direction that the remark either be struck from the record or that the Hon. Member be asked to withdraw it when he is in the House.

I do not know if Your Honour has a copy of *Hansard* but it is clearly indicated that he used an unparliamentary word.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Chair will have a look at *Hansard*, which I have not had time to do yet today. If there is any language which needs to be struck out or withdrawn, I am sure that the Hon. Member mentioned by the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) will see what is reported in *Hansard*, do the honourable thing and withdraw later today.

Resuming debate with the Hon. Member for Davenport.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Madam Speaker, the concluding words of the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) in his last intervention were brave words. They would be credible if we had achieved in Canada a ready common market across our own nation. If that were so we could believe his call to go out to conquer the world, so to speak. However, we have not even achieved that. Therefore, it seems to me that what he is really putting forward is just a little bit more of the same Progressive Conservative rhetoric.

In this debate it seems that what the Conservatives have chosen to do is to ignore the fact that the issue of trade involves more than just trade. Of equal importance is the fact that they have neglected the preoccupation among Canadians that is now emerging as a result of the measurements that we obtain from polls, namely, that what we have been debating here yesterday, today and in the preceding weeks is really a debate on values. What is taking place this morning on the floor of the House of Commons, and tomorrow when we vote, is a comparison on a set of values as they have driven us so far, and as they will determine the future of our nation, and the behaviour of Canadians.

● (1150)

Why do I say that it is more than trade? Why do I say that this debate reaches an importance of the size and with the implications and impact of the Meech Lake debate? It is because in the long term the implications are immense, far reaching, and well beyond trade. What we are debating here is economic union in North America. That is the substance of this deal, which has been given the wrong title. It is an economic union in North America that is being proposed here, not on January 1, 1989, perhaps not in the next five years, but in the long term. That is what it is. The Government should at least have the decency to tell Canadians that, and Canadians may then want to decide if that is what they want. However, it has to be put on the table, so to speak.