

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in today's discussion of Canada's foreign policy initiated by my colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs. I want to share with honourable members today some thoughts on the role of trade in Canadian foreign policy, sketch possible policy directions, and encourage discussion on how we can best proceed.

I am also pleased to co-sponsor the Foreign Policy Forum, to be held a week from now, to seek the views of a broad range of Canadians on public policy. I also look forward to the subsequent work that will be undertaken by the Parliamentary Committee.

The importance of trade to Canadian foreign policy has long been a central principle of our vision of international relations. When former Prime Minister Lester Pearson delivered his 1957 Nobel Peace Prize address, he entitled it "The Four Faces of Peace." His first face of peace -- and the one of which he spoke most eloquently -- was international trade. "The higher man sets his economic goals in this age of mass democracy," Pearson argued, "the more essential it is to political stability and peace that we trade as freely as possible." By promoting freer trade among nations, we would help to build international partnerships of mutual advantage and support. And by constructing an international system of binding rights and obligations we would help to ensure that the rule of law prevails over the rule of unrestrained power.

Almost forty years later this message has an even greater resonance. The globalization of production, the growth of knowledge-based industries, and the shift in wealth and power to the Asia-Pacific region all point to the rise of a new international economic order.

Increasingly, it is more accurate to speak not of trade policy as such, but of international economic policy. Jurisdictions and policy areas that have long been considered to be quintessentially domestic are now increasingly subject to international negotiation and rule-making. Both the Government and the private sector must now deal not only with tariffs and export subsidy practices, but also with investment policy, intellectual property, competition policy and R&D [research and development]. Even social programs, previously the sole preserve of national governments, are coming under the trade negotiator's microscope or, at the very least, are being reshaped in response to the inexorable pressures of the international marketplace.

It is also commonly accepted that attempts on the part of national governments to shield themselves from these changes are not only illusory but fraught with danger.

Admittedly, this has not stopped certain governments from attempting to do just that. In the United States, a current political preoccupation in some quarters is Japan, which enjoys a