

*Oral Questions*

One clear message coming out of that forum from all those participants from all provinces was that there must be a new national focus, preserving provincial jurisdiction but bringing together all the partners in the country to arrive at a forward-looking prospect for this situation. There is no more important issue in the country.

I challenge the House, and the Government in particular, to find a mechanism, in the spirit of Meech Lake, to forge a partnership which will focus on one of the most important issues before us, that is, the cause of young people and particularly post-secondary education.

\* \* \*

**TRADE****MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES—EFFECT OF CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT**

**Mr. Brian White (Dauphin—Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, there was a study on free trade published in 1984 by the Ontario Economic Council entitled "Trade, Industrial Policy and Canadian Manufacturing", by Richard Harris and David Cox. The study predicted that free trade would bring about a boom in Canadian manufacturing which would be of significant benefit to Canada, and Ontario in particular. Most major business organizations agree with the Harris and Cox assessment and are confident that Canadian companies will prosper under the Canada-U.S. trade agreement.

Opposition to the initiative by the Ontario Government may, therefore, be of some political value, but makes very little economic sense. Ontario, and the Government of Manitoba, have mounted anti-free trade campaigns based on confusion, fear and uncertainty. Equally illogical is the opposition of the labour unions to the trade agreement.

A recent Environics and *Globe and Mail* poll showed that 46 per cent of union members think free trade is a good idea. This indicates their confidence in the expected boom in manufacturing and the resulting benefits to those employed in that sector.

Therefore, opposition to free trade obviously reflects the personal ideology of union leaders, based not on economic sense but on political opportunism.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**TRADE****CANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT—CHIEF NEGOTIATOR'S STATEMENT ON POSITION OF OPPONENTS**

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External

Affairs. Yesterday Canada's chief trade negotiator, Simon Reisman, said publicly that opponents of the Prime Minister's free trade deal are using "the big lie, as practised in Nazi Germany".

When asked about that this morning on television the Minister for International Trade said, "Oh, Mr. Reisman is entitled to his views I don't feel that it's very fair . . . to ask me to comment on a personal opinion by Simon Reisman".

Was the Minister's colleague serious? How can she condone remarks like that made by an ambassador, Canada's top trade official, who speaks publicly on behalf of the Government? What did the Minister for International Trade mean when she said that it is all right for the chief trade negotiator, speaking publicly as an ambassador, to criticize and charge that the people who oppose this trade deal are Nazis? How can the Government put up with this, or is it condoning these shocking comments?

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, in the selective quotes which he has used in the House the Hon. Member did not give my views which I expressed on that television show. I said, "We are all Canadians . . . we all love our country," and we are all entitled to our views.

I went on and said that those who are for free trade are Canadians confident in our future who know that we are the best in the world. Those who are against free trade tend to be protectionist and fearful. However, we are all Canadians, we are all entitled to our views, and we are all encouraged to participate in the debate.

**REQUEST THAT MINISTER DISAVOW NEGOTIATOR'S PERSONAL OPINIONS**

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister must realize that when Simon Reisman speaks he speaks as an ambassador on behalf of the Government and as its chief trade negotiator. When Mr. Reisman speaks the Minister cannot make a distinction between his personal opinions and the views of the Government.

Will the Minister, here and now, make it clear that Ambassador Reisman was not speaking on behalf of the Government and that he cannot express personal opinions when he speaks as trade negotiator and ambassador? If she does not do that, she is condoning his words. If that is the case, Mr. Reisman should resign and she should resign.

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Member did not mean to suggest that Mr. Reisman should be restricted in any expression of his personal views.

**Ms. Copps:** He's an ambassador.

**Miss Carney:** If he does suggest that Mr. Reisman should be restricted in his views, he has more courage than I in trying to make that point known to Mr. Reisman.