

Ms. Copps: The trade deal preceded the GATT decision. You do not know anything about it.

Mr. McDermid: We have an excellent advisory committee under the chairmanship of Mr. de Grandpré who will be making recommendations on adjustment procedures that are required, if any—

Ms. Copps: People are going bankrupt today.

Mr. McDermid: The Hon. Member who delivers her best speeches from the seat of her pants should know that and understand that.

● (1140)

Motion No. 12 states:

"7. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be interpreted so as to affect or preclude the continuation of existing or the establishment of new regional development programs."

That motion is extremely misleading. Regional development programs are not covered by the Act or the agreement.

Ms. Copps: Come on!

Mr. McDermid: Moreover, it is misleading to state that nothing in this agreement shall affect regional development. The agreement itself will positively affect regional development, since the economic benefits of the free trade agreement will be felt throughout all regions of Canada, and any legitimate study has shown that. The support that we have in western Canada and in Atlantic Canada is ample proof. Therefore, that amendment is not necessary.

I want to talk about the establishment of new Canadian social programs. We have introduced a new Canadian social program since the free trade agreement was signed—the child care legislation which is presently being debated in the House. If we could not introduce new social programs why, in heaven's name, would the United States not object now to the day care program?

The other day I listened to my friend, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), talk about how our health care will be wiped out, education will be wiped out, and all those things will happen. Let us examine the facts. First, provincial Governments have absolutely no obligation to contract out health services, health care management, or education. There is no obligation. Second, even if they chose to do so, they may give preference or exclusivity to Canadians. They are not affected by the procurement obligations. The provincial Government can state that only Canadians can provide services to us here and would absolutely not be in violation of the free trade agreement.

All the free trade agreement states is that if a province decides to allow an American company to come in, as Ontario allowed a management company to come in and try to straighten out the mess at the Hawkesbury hospital, it has to be treated fairly. That is what the free trade agreement states,

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

but it does not say that they have to be allowed in. Americans can be kept out of health care in this country if the province desires. The Hon. Member talks about the blood bank in Montreal. That was a decision permitted by the provincial Government. It has absolutely nothing to do with the free trade agreement, and it has absolutely nothing to do with the federal Government whatsoever.

Ms. Copps: That's totally false. It's the Canadian Blood Committee. It's the federal Government's responsibility.

Mr. McDermid: There she goes again. She's the expert on everything.

Ms. Copps: Do you know anything about the Canadian Blood Committee?

Mr. McDermid: She knows the whole ball of wax, and we love to hear her speak from the seat of her pants.

Mr. Hopkins: You are the greenhorn, John.

Mr. McDermid: Well, I will stack my knowledge on the free trade agreement up against the knowledge of the agreement of the Hon. Member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins) any time. I will debate him any time, anywhere, on the free trade agreement, because he has not read further than page 2 yet.

Mr. Hopkins: That's not much of a challenge, John.

Ms. Copps: Eganville.

Mr. McDermid: Great. I love Eganville, and I am well known in Eganville.

Mr. Hopkins: I'll say you are.

Mr. McDermid: I will look forward to going into Eganville any time.

In conclusion, the Hon. House Leader of the Liberal Party rose today and told everybody that all our social services add to the cost of the goods and services we buy in this country. That was his first statement. He said that because of that it put us in an unfair advantage and therefore we would have to reduce our social programs. In the next breath he said our social programs would be looked upon by the Americans as unfair trade practice and that they were going to attack them. The Hon. Member cannot have it both ways. If it makes our goods more expensive, how can it be an unfair competition? Why would the Americans complain at all? The arguments brought forward are total nonsense. They are scaremongering. These amendments should be rejected out of hand.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make a few statements on Motion Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. The Parliamentary Secretary suggested that these were irrelevant. He even suggested that they were improper, and he could not understand why they were in there in any case.