

this year shipments of Canadian steel to the United States in a fair and free trading market were down 9.3 per cent. Half that reduction in shipment was a direct result of Canadian industry, in response to rising American protectionism, voluntarily cutting back on its imports. Also in the first months of the mandate of a Prime Minister who was to have a wonderful and productive relationship with the President of the United States, we see that the Canadian share of the U.S. steel market has dropped from 3.2 per cent to 3 per cent. Sources within the U.S. steel industry would like to see that percentage further reduced to 2.4 per cent. Instead of the Prime Minister and the Government spending money on developing sophisticated communications documents in an attempt to infringe upon the responsibilities of opposition Members, they should tell the House why, in light of this new relationship between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada, the Canadian share of the steel market was reduced this year as a direct result of those measures. Why is it that the Canadian Government is not responding to American measures which would see a loss, if in fact the Canadian share of the U.S. steel market was reduced to 2.4 per cent, as suggested by certain sources in the U.S. steel industry, of almost 6,000 Canadian jobs? Where are the Prime Minister and the Government when it comes to fighting the rising tide of U.S. protectionism?

The Prime Minister did not comment in the House today on press reports dealing with the response of the President of the United States to protectionism. He is setting up a \$300 million American war chest to help U.S. exporters compete against subsidized foreign exports in markets abroad. We saw, in fact, the U.S. response when it came to consulting Canada on the devaluation of the U.S. dollar. Was the Prime Minister of Canada even in the picture? Was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) at the meeting? Was the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) involved in a decision which could obviously impact very directly on steel jobs and other jobs in the so-called international market between Canada and the United States, and I think of the auto market? Where was Canada when it came to this new, important role as espoused by the Prime Minister when he went to New York and said, "We are open for business".

● (1550)

In fact, the blind, bended knee, hands on approach of the Prime Minister with respect to embracing the notion of free trade is just another example of the Schefferville solution to Canada's economic problems. I would suggest to the Prime Minister and to his colleagues, whether they be the tuna tacticians in his office or other experts in communications, that they should spend less time trying to verbally assassinate the Opposition in documents such as the one which was given to the Speaker today.

I am not surprised. We heard about the interview that the Prime Minister gave to *Fortune* Magazine in which he said quite clearly that in his opinion Canadians cannot compete. I am not surprised when there is this kind of second rate, second class mentality that he suggests in this document that the

Customs Tariff

strategy for selling free trade should rely less on educating the general public than on getting the message across that trade initiative is a good idea—in other words, a selling job.

The so-called public support generated for the Prime Minister's grand scheme of global free trade negotiations should be recognized as extremely soft and likely to evaporate rapidly if the debate is allowed to get out of control, and thereby erode the central focus of the message. Talk about doublespeak, talk about Orwellian overtones of political and media manipulation. In fact the Prime Minister, through this document, through his office, has suggested that we should attempt to contain debate on the most important issue that is facing this country in this decade and that is the question of free trade.

The Hon. Member asks what this has to do with the Customs and Excise tax. Presumably, Mr. Speaker, I am following along the debate which was opened—I understand the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling) is commenting on the validity of what this has to do with the question at hand. I would like to refer him to *Hansard*, page 6868, Commons Debates, September 23, in which the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance is suggesting that one of the reasons for the speedy passage of Bill C-21 is because the protectionist trend typical of international exchanges today demands our serious attention. Presumably we are attempting to respond to that attention by comments here in the House.

When you look at specific comments from the Government's communications strategy it is unfortunate that the Government does not want to have a full, fair and free debate on the issue of free trade. He states:

Members whose own ridings can be expected to benefit from the initiative will likely be under a complicated and conflicting set of pressures. These can be productively exploited. Research should be undertaken to identify economic and trade interests of the 70 ridings now held by the two Opposition Parties as well as those held by the Government.

He goes on to further state:

With respect to individual members of the Liberal Party, a survey of key members and constituencies will identify circumstances where non-support of the government's initiative would be either difficult or hypocritical. As examples, the riding of the Leader of the Opposition, the Right Honourable John Turner, is in the Province of British Columbia—a province whose forest resource sector must ensure and enhance trade opportunities in the United States and which is currently coming under fire from congressional and individual state protectionist policies; Sheila Copps, whose Hamilton, Ontario riding has the steel industry to represent, and Don Johnston whom in the previous Liberal administration leadership campaign was a key spokesperson for economic enhancement and increased trade relations with the United States.

I suppose I should be flattered to be considered in the Government's document as a so-called member of a key constituency. Obviously the constituency of Hamilton East is the constituency in Canada which is key when it comes to international trade, but I further point to the example of the trail of broken promises and the trail of protectionist policies which has led in the first seven months of this year to a reduction of almost 10 per cent in the amount of Canadian steel that has been exported to the United States.

I know the Government Members would love to hearken back to the sins of past Liberal administrations, to point the finger at us as they have done with the demise of the Canadian