

Customs Tariff

Mr. Fontaine: Come to my riding.

Ms. McLaughlin: I would be happy to do that as well. I am sorry that I do not have the historical perspective to refer back to 1965. I would like to say that I was not born then, but that would be incorrect. I will, however refer to a few comments made by the current Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) as quoted in *Maclean's* magazine in 1983. With regard to free trade he said:

Unrestrained free trade with the United States raises the possibility that thousands of jobs could be lost in such critical industries as textiles, furniture and footwear. Before we jump on the bandwagon of continentalism, we should strengthen our industrial structure so that we are more competitive.

The term "free trade" is extremely misleading. I would have thought that someone from his side of the House would not have thought there was a free lunch and would not be trying to tell the Canadian people that there is a free lunch by using that statement. This is a Mulroney-Reagan trade deal.

[Translation]

Mr. Leblanc: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a fairly direct question to the Hon. Member for the NDP and socialist Party, as my colleague said earlier. What does she have to say about the fact that entrepreneurs, investors, business people and all our captains of industry are in favour of free trade? How come—I must say I think this is horrifying and I can't understand why they do this—how come the New Democratic Party and a number of labour leaders are against free trade, when at the same time, the people who do the investing and who take the risks, the people who are responsible for the money they invest, how come they are in favour of free trade, and their employees or perhaps rather their representatives—In fact, I talked to several employees and union members who said they did not support the negative statements made by their union leaders.

What we have here is a complete paradox. The person who has the responsibility and who does the risk taking says he is in favour of free trade, and the person who does not take the risks is against free trade, and with him the NDP. I don't understand. Would the Hon. Member care to comment?

● (1400)

[English]

Ms. McLaughlin: Mr. Speaker, as a former business person myself, I would like first to say that we in the New Democratic Party speak to both businessmen and businesswomen. There is no homogeneous opinion. I think that must be quite clear to members opposite as it is to members on this side of the House. That is what the debate of the Mulroney—Reagan trade deal is all about. There is no homogeneous opinion from businessmen or businesswomen.

I would say that there are many people in my riding, and in other ridings, to whom I have spoken, particularly small business people, who are extremely concerned not about just the short-term implications, but about the long-term implications. We are looking to the future of Canada, not to Canada

in 1989 but to Canada in the year 2009 and 1999. I believe one of the things we are here to do is to debate those different perspectives with both businessmen and businesswomen.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker—and I see we have a very distinguished Speaker this afternoon—I would like to speak on the Broadbent-White opposition to the free and fair trade agreement. However, first I would like to read something into the record:

Expansion of our trade with any and all countries willing to trade on a fair and equitable basis will benefit both ourselves and them. Careful planning is needed to adjust our production to the trade requirements of a fully employed economy. Tariffs are out-moded patchwork attempts to protect domestic industry; they restrict trade while giving less and less protection to the home industry.

One would think that this comes from the Conservative Party manual, but it does not. It comes from the New Democratic Party, a Party which is all over the map. It has policy conferences, all kinds of statements and policies on trade as of last March, but after those Members come away from their convention, they take a totally different position. I would like to quote some of the New Democratic Party trade resolutions; first, "Increased activities promote trade". That is what we are doing. The New Democratic Party has other policies. There is one thing about the NDP, one always knows where it stands. It has two positions, for and against it. I will give you, Mr. Speaker, another statement: "Pursue mature state-to-state relationship and cease to deal with the U.S. on an issue-by-issue basis". Why has the NDP not stuck with that policy that it supported last March? I find it very strange that that Party has walked away from it. Here is another one: "Focus Canadian efforts on resolving specific disputes". That is exactly what we are doing. The NDP goes on to say: "Explore sectoral free trade with the U.S. and other countries with production safeguards similar to the Auto Pact". That is exactly what we are doing.

The Hon. Speaker knows all about what the socialists and labour unions did when they formed the European Economic Community. They were howling and screaming against it. Now there are 13 countries in the European Economic Community. Thousands and thousands of jobs have been created. Nobody lost their identity, their culture, their heritage, and we do not hear a squeak or a peep out of the unions, the labour movement or the socialists in the European Economic Community now. And we will silence them all before we are finished.

Ms. McLaughlin: I just remind the Hon. Member that the Democratic Party—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ellis): I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the time for questions and comments has expired. However, we will give her just a moment to respond briefly.

Ms. McLaughlin: I will just briefly say that the New Democratic Party does not stand for hitching itself to one star, that is, the United States, which will just drag it down, but,