

*Free Trade*

stage in the new process of coming to grips with one of these unfair acts, will take up to 315 days, or almost one year potentially, to correct some unfair action. Even at the end, and God knows how many months beyond that it will go on, the U.S. Congress still retains its right to take unfair action against Canadians who happen to be winning the competition.

To paraphrase an old Conservative, rarely has so much been given away by a Government to get so little, as the Government of Canada has done in this particular deal.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** I wish to conclude my remarks today by dealing with two final matters. The Government has not attempted to defend the details of what it has brought out, and I suspect that it never will. But it has indulged in two types of arguments about those of us on the other side of this very important historical issue. On the one hand, the Government has stated that it is either this or nothing; that lofty intellectual argument that we either accept this particular proposal, or there is nothing else around. That certainly shows the limits of the Conservative imagination. It is this deal or nothing.

I will not go on at length, Mr. Speaker, since I have done so in other speeches in the House and outside, but today I simply want to say to Canadians that there are alternatives. One does not have to accept a bad deal in place of other options that are open to us as a nation. I wish to put it in context. When the Government started negotiations there was a surplus in our commercial trade of some \$20 billion in the very year the negotiations were launched. As I said in another context when talking to a business person, only a Conservative would be so stupid as to remind the U.S. Congress, most of whom were quite asleep on this particular point, that we had a \$20 billion surplus. Mentioning that point woke many Americans up to that reality. But we had a \$20 billion surplus when the negotiations started, and even this year when the figures came out, I believe last Thursday, they showed that the surplus up to October of this year was running at a \$10.1 billion in terms of trade with the U.S.

The point I want to make here is that, in terms of the so-called *status quo*, we are doing quite well in terms of our trade with the United States. One might even say that we have been winning the competition. As a Canadian, what pleases me particularly is looking at some of the new areas. It is not only as the hewers of wood and the drawers of water that we have been doing well in recent years.

My research staff have prepared some data comparing our exports to the United States from 1980 to 1986 to see how well we have been doing. Some interesting patterns emerged. In the manufacturing field, crushing and milling machinery and parts, we exported to the United States some \$7.4 million in 1980, and in 1986 that had gone up to \$19.5 million. In construction machinery and equipment we exported \$36 million in 1980, which had gone up to \$76 million in 1986. In parts for pulp and paper industrial machinery we exported

\$49.8 million in 1980, and that was up to \$60 million in 1986. In aircraft assembly we exported \$561 million in 1980, and that was up to \$1.150 billion in 1986. In radar equipment and related devices and parts we exported \$5 million in 1980, and \$33 million in 1986. In commercial telecommunications equipment we exported \$122 million in 1980, and that was up to \$260 million in 1986.

The point I wish to make with only a few of those statistics is that there has been an interesting and important development of the Canadian economy in the last 10 to 15 years, which one can begin to see in this six year period of statistics. Finally, we are getting away from being simply an exporter of raw materials. We have been winning the competition. I wish to remind the Prime Minister that we do not have to take a back seat to the United States of America. We are doing very well.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** Among other things, my Party has stated that we should build on those strengths. We can have bilateral arrangements in certain sectors with the United States. We should pursue a reduction in tariffs where there is unfair access to the United States, most effectively, as others have argued in this debate, through the GATT working with other smaller-sized nations to deal with that big economic giant, the United States, to receive fairer trade practices. We have said that we should expand our efforts in trade to the Pacific Rim, to South America and Central America. We have lost some of our older markets in Europe because this Government has concentrated so much on the United States. We should be going back to some of those markets in Europe.

All of this should be embraced, in our judgment, in an over-all industrial strategy, in a mixed economy, recognizing provincial jurisdictional authority, and worked out with the provinces and the private sector to put in place an over-all industrial development strategy, geared to achieving one day full employment. That can be done. The Austrians, the Swedes, and the Japanese have done it, and it is time that we did it, because we can do it. There are other options, I say to the people of Canada, than this big giveaway which the Conservatives want them to accept.

• (1450)

The second argument, which the Government has attempted to use, whether it is in the House or out in the country, has been that all confident and imaginative Canadians are for this deal—whether they be male, female, westerners, easterners, central Canadians, farmers, or auto workers, that everyone of a positive, imaginative, and confident bent is for this deal, and everyone who does not fit into those categories of positive human attributes is on the other side. It argues that all those who have fear and apprehension and are lacking in confidence are opposed.

If we are going to make a guess about this, it is exactly the reverse of what the Government is going to say. However, I am