

*Extension of Sittings*

message clear as we did during this campaign so that when Parliament comes together after the election the people have a clear understanding of what is before them. Thus when the majority Party takes office it is entitled to its legislation with proper debate, but not obstruction, with clear statements of principle on the part of the Government, on the part of the opposition Parties, but not obstruction, not trying to hijack the system.

I say to Members: Let us debate. Let us debate free trade. Let us state our points. But let us pass the legislation because the people of Canada have decided. Free trade is the future for Canada. It is the horizon, the hope for the Canadian people. Let us have that legislation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. J. Ronald Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, as a new Member from St. Boniface, of which I am very proud, what is most important for me and I believe also for all Canadians in the provinces and two territories is that every Member be able to speak on every issue that he or she feels important for his or her constituency, province and country. And that is exactly what I intend to do.

I have just arrived, I am brand new and I admit that I have a lot to learn. For example, what struck me is that the Government has greatly embellished or somewhat exaggerated many things and has sometimes been contradictory.

Let us take one example. When they talk about spreading fear, it seems to me that the Government has contributed to this situation. I remember a press release stating that two million families would suffer if the agreement were not implemented. That is fear-mongering!

I heard many times that if the Government were not elected, the dollar would fall, the economy would collapse and our links with the United States and other countries would be weakened. What I found most disturbing during the election campaign was the interference of leaders of other countries. For example, the President of the United States took the liberty to make a speech in which he referred to this agreement. This same gentleman had said after concluding the agreement with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), that it was the realization of the American dream. And later on, the Prime Minister of England also meddled in our affairs.

I ask, with all due respect, whether they took the time to read the Agreement. Have they read the Agreement? Have they really understood it? And if they neither read

nor understood it, did they have the right to interfere and make favourable comments on this Agreement?

I would point out that not only the Opposition parties have raised serious questions about this Agreement. Many groups have done so, and here are some of them: an impressive number of women's organizations from almost every part of the country, unions throughout Canada, at least 90 environmental groups, cultural groups throughout Canada and a large number of churches in Canada. I know at least five that have spoken out. Business men and women from small, medium and large companies have also done so.

We are being led to believe that business men and women are all for the agreement, that they want to support it. But that is false. And I sincerely believe that if they did not feel muzzled, they would have spoken up much more loudly about its shortcomings.

I like to believe that all these people whom I have just mentioned, and I identified only a few, are not always wrong.

[*English*]

During the election campaign we were told that a number of issues that we had raised were not at all being threatened, for example, our culture. This is a real concern to a number of groups, for example, our new Canadians, our northern and native peoples, *les francophones hors Québec*.

We were told, as well, that our environmental standards would not suffer, that the very serious problem of acid rain and the thinning of the ozone layer which has caused numerous kinds of medical problems would in fact not suffer as a result of this particular accord. We were also informed that our regional development programs would not be hampered in any of serious way. We were told that our control and pricing of our natural resources would not be jeopardized. We were also told many, many times that our social programs would in no way be negatively affected now or in the future. We were told that our working men and women would not lose better jobs than those that might be created by the Mulroney-Reagan agreement, that when they were displaced they would be entitled to assistance and retraining and/or moving and adjustment expenditures.

If all of this is in fact true then what the people of St. Boniface—and I think many people throughout Canada—are really requesting is that that be put down very simply and clearly, not in some isolated or remote section of the accord or in the appendix, but that it be written simply and clearly so that their fears can in fact be removed.