the critics are playing political football with the future prosperity of our country.

Take, for instance, the comments of the Premier of Ontario on Saturday. He stated he had not yet read the final trade text but, even without reading the pact, his mind was made up in spite of the study his own Treasurer and senior Cabinet colleague released that showed the trade deal is very good for Ontario and the Canadian economy.

The Premier has commented today that the whole deal is coal. His comments are made with an open mouth and a closed mind. I can tell him that the residents of Ontario and the Canadian people are expecting more than these uninformed statements. They are expecting intelligent debate. They want to know the facts, know of the benefits this trade deal will bring them, and not the hollow rhetoric of the Liberal Premier.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS—STATEMENTS ATTRIBUTED TO MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, the Government claims that it wants to talk about the trade deal but, in fact, judging by its representatives who are going across the country, if they are any indication of the calibre of the debate, it is pretty disgusting.

• (1410)

Last week there were press reports that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie), the Minister sent by the Government to represent the Government's view, made comments about me and about other women. When I raised the question of surrogate parenting, the Minister said before a public meeting the following:

> No wonder her book was entitled *Nobody's Baby*. Apparently, our Canadian womanhood is in severe danger they'd have to creep around the country with their knees crossed if Sheila is correct that this danger—

The Minister also called himself the father of Canada's anti-pornography legislation, but said before the St. John's Board of Trade that he loves pornography himself but he wants to protect the people from it. He went on to tear after a nun who happened to speak out against the trade deal.

I would like to ask if this Minister is representing the Government. If he is not representing the Government, he should resign and get himself off the speaking circuit. If he is representing the Government, it is a disgusting, anti-woman, sexist, anti-—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Hon. Member could put a question another time.

S. O. 21

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

ALBERTA—ATTRACTION OF INDUSTRY FROM MANITOBA

Mr. Felix Holtmann (Selkirk—Interlake): Mr. Speaker, business growth and job opportunities are being snuffed out by a New Democratic Government in Manitoba. According to *The Winnipeg Sun*, the warm business climate in Tory Alberta is pulling Westfair Foods and 400 head office jobs away from the wintry blasts of Manitoba's New Democratic Government. A representative of Westfair is quoted as saying:

> We felt unwelcomed here, the provincial Government of Alberta wants us there, they would see us as a valuable part of their economy . . . Manitoba Government takes the attitude that if you are a certain size they may expropriate you or drive you out of the province.

The reason for this is simple. Payroll taxes are now at 2.5 per cent. There is a regressive final offer selection for labour disputes. There have been increased telephone rates, increased hydro rates, increased Auto Pact rates, and government service rates have increased by 20 per cent. When Westfair and 400 jobs go, how can this Government say it is standing up for Manitoba?

I have a solution. Industry Minister Vic Schroeder should go. No, Mr. Pawley should go. No, the New Democratic Government of Manitoba should go and call an election before the rest of Manitoba's businesses leave. He is not standing up for Manitoba. He does not know what standing up for Manitoba is.

* * *

NUCLEAR ENERGY

LOW-LEVEL RADIATION HAZARDS—RE-EVALUATION OF NUCLEAR INDUSTRY URGED

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, research reported in the press today confirms what a growing number of experts have been telling us for years, which is that the hazards from low-level radiation have been greatly underestimated. New standards for acceptable-dose risks must now been determined at roughly half the levels previously allowed.

For Canada, this means a serious reassessment of our entire nuclear industry, from mining and processing to nuclear reactors through to waste disposal. The whole atoms for peace hope may prove to have been a sad mistake as even low-level exposure can mean cancer deaths, mental impairment, and genetic deformities.

Note that I am not even talking about a meltdown, nuclear war, or a disaster on the scale of Chernobyl, but simply about low-level, long-term exposure. The people of Canada and their Governments must now re-evaluate the nuclear option against the alternatives of safe, renewable energy and the promotion of conservation. We must have the courage to ask the really tough questions, be prepared to admit we were wrong in the