

*Oral Questions*

which they will be free to impose duties—a duty here, a duty there, duties everywhere!

[*English*]

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** By God, Mr. Speaker, it is time for Turner really to worry.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mulroney:** I commend my colleague for asking such a relevant question. I think that the Minister has already pointed out the benefits and problems which, of course, flow from such a complex negotiation—\$150 billion a year between two partners is bound to create serious and complex problems. However the Economic Council of Canada released today a very comprehensive report entitled “Changing Times” in which it explains that the benefits for Canadians may turn out to be the creation of hundreds of thousands of new jobs.

I should think that, notwithstanding the temporary setbacks, my colleague will agree with me that these jobs are justification enough for us to remain at the bargaining table to conclude a comprehensive agreement with the Americans because it is in the national interest of Canada.

[*English*]

## QUEBEC SUMMIT MEETING

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister not feel at this stage, with each of these attacks which has hit this country and with each of these assaults which has hit our commerce, that the agreement he had personally with Ronald Reagan has been definitely transgressed? Does the Prime Minister not feel that the good faith which lay behind that has now been destroyed?

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member is ignoring the reality of the situation. There was nothing in the Shamrock Summit that said U.S. laws, or Canadian laws, must be immediately ruled out. It was very clear that the U.S. system in place and the Canadian system in place must continue. Their legislation must continue until such time as it is replaced with a trade treaty that will provide for the kind of remedies the Member is discussing.

● (1430)

## ONTARIO POSITION ON LUMBER NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, the Shamrock Summit committed both countries to respecting the other as fully as possible and to working as strongly as possible against protectionist moves. The Minister knows that.

My supplementary question to the Minister, since she chooses to answer in these cases, is, how does she intend to continue negotiations on the softwood lumber case since the

Province of Ontario has decided that it will not participate in those negotiations?

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the provinces are the owners of the resource in this case. The Government of Ontario has participated in these discussions because it owns the resource. I have been advised that officials are meeting tonight to discuss what strategy is open to us, and to analyse the decision. Members of the U.S. Commerce Department are here today discussing this issue, and officials from all Governments, I am advised, are meeting tonight to discuss it.

\* \* \*

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

## FORGET COMMISSION—FINANCING OF OPERATIONS

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. As the person responsible for the Government, will he tell this House if it is correct that the Forget Commission has been financed from the unemployment insurance account in the amount of \$5.8 million so far? If so, who approved this highly irregular expenditure of moneys destined for the unemployed, and under what authority?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I think the Forget Commission was a commission Canadians generally had been waiting for to assess the system, and I think it is perfectly normal Canadians should assume responsibility for the costs of this commission. Perhaps the Hon. Member will recall that in 1981, the Gersberg Task Force on Unemployment Insurance, chaired by Mr. Gersberg and under a Government the Hon. Member has known quite well, was basically financed in exactly the same way.

[*English*]

## RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINANCING

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister has not answered the question.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Allmand:** That was an internal committee and quite different from a commission recommending the cutting of benefits for the unemployed. Does the Minister think it proper that a fund contributed to by workers and employers for the unemployed should be used to finance a commission like this? As well, has he checked on the legality of such an expenditure in light of Section 135 of the Unemployment Insurance Act?