

Customs Tariff

rules and regulations under which this Act will function will not be ready until at least three months after that date, probably around April. Legislation is one thing, but if you are in business and you are affected by any legislation, you must take the time to really understand the rules and regulations. If we have 3,000 pages to go through in the one instance, the rules and regulations will of course be equally complex.

I mention again the particular limitations of small business. We in the NDP certainly feel that small business is one of the stand-bys of Canadian business, and we know that the majority of jobs created in Canada are the result of the efforts of the small business person. I might mention that in *The Globe and Mail* today there was a very good article about the role of women in small business and how successful business run by women has been.

This request simply to extend the time so that everyone can understand what is happening does not seem unreasonable to me. We have just been through a very lengthy debate on the Meech Lake Accord. One of the very basic criticisms one hears as you go around this country is that there was not sufficient time for people to be consulted about that Accord. It was seen that First Ministers agreed to it in a very short time with little public consultation. That is a responsibility and a charge which I think everyone in this House must address.

It is a similar situation with the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement. We are being asked to sanction the free trade road show which is going to go around the country listening to people's views. That is very important, but again it is to be done within a very short time frame, with a very clear objective, and one wonders how many average Canadians will get on the agenda when those hearings arrive in their community. I certainly hope that, unlike other such hearings, the committee makes sure it goes to the Northwest Territories and Yukon where there are many questions about this agreement. We see some parallels here in that this is a complex Bill and we think it reasonable that the people affected have the time to consider it.

One can understand why the Canadian public seems to get a little confused at times by some of the things that happen as a result of the passage of this legislation. I have mentioned before that even the title is pretty difficult for people to understand. I am not necessarily criticizing it, but the public sometimes gets a couple of different messages from people when it is explained what it will mean to them. I would like to give some examples of that in the current Mulroney-Reagan trade debate.

In 1983 *Maclean's* magazine said that David Crombie—

Some Hon. Members: Order!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ellis): The Hon. Member should know that personal names are not used. I know I am going to get some points of order if she does not refer to Members by their riding or ministry.

Ms. McLaughlin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Crombie) said in 1983, according to *Maclean's* magazine, referring to the free trade deal, that, "It's silly". I do not know that I would use such highly technical language, but it certainly is confusing for a number of people. I want to give a few examples of that.

Recently, in fact last week in Washington, a U.S. Republican Senator, Mr. Murkowski, called Canada's position on Alaskan oil development inconsistent with our position in favour of wilderness designation of the Alaskan coastal plain. If you are not familiar with it, that issue concerns the Arctic national wildlife refuge which contains the largest caribou herd, the one of a kind porcupine caribou herd, on which many people from my riding rely for their existence. We have had negotiations with the Americans on this issue, and in support of the Government I must say that it has been very supportive of the idea of having this area designated as a wildlife refuge. However, at the same time, in the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement, we seem to have negotiated access to Prudhoe Bay oil. What Senator Murkowski says is: Make up your mind. On the one hand you are saying, "Keep this land a wild refuge", and on the other you say, "Open up areas for access to oil". This is confusing to the Americans, to the average Canadian, and pretty confusing to me. We seem to be giving two messages to people.

Certainly this tariff Bill is an extremely important Bill to understand because there is so much discussion right now about the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal. I believe there will be some considerable confusion in the public's mind because so many people hear every night on television and read in the newspapers various and sundry versions of the deal. Of course, we have not seen a final version, what it will mean, and so on. Some people will assume there is some link here. I am not suggesting that. However, there are a few things we have to point out about the trade deal which have led to some of this confusion.

First, in the free trade deal we saw the U.S. get most of what it wanted. It wanted full access to Canadian energy supplies and got it. It wanted an open market for investment in Canada, and it got that. This is also the first time that free trade in services was included in a trade pact. There is some question that this might be a model the U.S. can use at GATT to open up services world-wide.

We have had much discussion in this House about Bill C-22, the drug Bill, and I will not go into that. Yet the Mulroney-Reagan trade agreement calls into question our ability to stand up for Canadian sovereignty, Canadian direction and protection of our intellectual property.

Another area I would like to mention briefly concerns the elimination of western grain transportation subsidies. To say a word about subsidies, when speaking in our various communities one often picks up the idea, quite well promulgated by the Americans, that the U.S. has a free enterprise system, and there are really no subsidies. It is a market where the strongest