

Before I begin today, I have an announcement to make. Dr. Pedersen, I know that you have been wanting to establish a new chair at Western, the William G. Davis Chair in International Trade. As Minister for that subject, I need no convincing of the importance of developing Canadian expertise in international trade, and neither do my colleagues in the Department of External Affairs.

I know you have been able to gather considerable private sector funds to support this initiative, and I am very pleased today to bring you some material support from the Government, as well. Please accept this cheque for \$15,000 toward the establishment of the William G. Davis Chair in International Trade.

. . . . .

It was almost precisely one year ago that the Government raised the possibility of negotiating a bilateral trade agreement with the United States. I have to take some of the blame for that, since I was the one who raised it -- in a white paper that listed four options for our trade with the States. One of the options was bilateral trade negotiations, and it certainly got everybody's attention.

"Attention" may be an understatement. The idea that we might negotiate a better trade deal -- with the country that is our biggest customer by far -- set off a barrage of charges and countercharges across the land.

For the first few months, we in the Government were not in a position to join the debate. We were consulting Canadians on the question. We were listening rather than talking. Then, in September, when we decided that bilateral negotiations were the best option for

Canada, we decided to take a Biblical approach to all the flying debris. It was a New Testament approach. Rather than answer all the charges -- and some of them were off the wall -- we decided to turn the other cheek.

Well, that approach has not noticeably lowered the noise level. All it seems to have done is leave the field to those who oppose to doing any kind of a deal with the States. So today I'm going to switch from the New Testament back to the Old. Today, it's an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.

I wish I could have made that "a truth for a truth" but that won't wash. The truth is that many of our most vocal critics just haven't done their homework. Their charges are backed by their emotions, not by studies and research. They have left the homework to us.

How much homework? Let me give you an idea. Between the middle of February and the second week in May I was criss-crossing the country to get the opinions of all Canadians who wanted to express them. I was here in London on April 22nd, for example.

And when the cross-country consultations were over, I came back to Ottawa to listen to the views of a score of delegations representing interest groups. Altogether, I've heard from business groups, consumer groups, labour unions, economists, academics, journalists, artists, musicians, publishers, film makers and, oh yes, the man in the street. And my officials have compiled studies on every sector of the economy.

We were not the only ones doing our homework, of course. The Macdonald Commission compiled a massive and impressive study. A Parliamentary