

Supply

However, any changes that do come about in trade policy need to be very carefully considered from the point of view of the impact on workers in Canada. As the Government rushed ahead with its very open policy—open for the United States but not for Canadians—bargaining chips were given away before we began. All the impact studies were issued in a very censored variety. We were told that if Canadians had access to all the impact studies concerning the possible effect of changes in our arrangements with the United States on employment and so on, this would facilitate the Americans' bargaining position. I find that hard to accept. Surely the Americans are sophisticated enough to have done their own impact studies; they are not sitting waiting for ours. But Canadians would like to know what to expect. Canadians would like to have had some warning of the disastrous results we are now seeing in the shingles and shakes industry.

If there are to be changes in our trade policy, we will have to talk about education, training and retraining. There will have to be moneys for labour adjustment. The Government has not spoken of any of this. We ourselves in Canada have many substantial interprovincial barriers to trade that block the movement of goods and services. We have not begun to deal with those. How can we go into a free trade agreement with the United States when we do not have a free trade agreement in our own country?

In any case, trade, important though it is, is not the full answer to increasing prosperity for Canada, nor is a trade agreement the full answer to enhancing trade. We should be doing more research and development. We have to modernize our plants and improve our marketing. We have to do these things because we have to be competitive in order to benefit from any trade agreement, whether it be with the United States or with some other country.

As the Government is talking about a free trade agreement with the United States, we are also seeing the moneys that go to the provinces for post-secondary education and medical care being capped. In the next six years something in the order of \$4 billion less than anticipated will be going to the provinces for post-secondary education and medical care. That does not seem very logical.

The sad fact is that the Americans have bargained their way around this Government to date and have run circles around it. We gave away the store before the talks began. The Government did not take Canadians into its confidence. There should have been a full, frank public debate within Canada on this major economic initiative before negotiations even started. The Government did not mention anything about free trade in the last election campaign; but three years ago the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was opposed to free trade arrangements. Before we got as far as we did the Government should have had full consultations with the people of Canada. There should have been a full debate in Parliament. There should have been full consultations with our provincial Governments

and extensive public hearings with leaders of industry, commerce, labour and academia.

Has the Government considered any free trade agreement discussions that it is going to have? What is going to happen to our medicare, our unemployment insurance and our regional development programs? We have already had our regional development programs and our unemployment insurance cited as non-tariff barriers or hidden subsidies. How is the Government proposing to avoid this happening again? These are all questions that have not been answered.

Essentially, we on this side of the House are all for improving our relations with our trading partner and neighbour, the United States. We are all for finding some sensible solution to the trading disputes that seem to come up very often. However, we think that our negotiations with the United States should be carried on in an international context, in the context, as the motion before us states, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Any multilateral or global trading policy that we would develop must, of course, have a very important U.S. component. But there are other countries too. Pacific Rim trade is important to us, as is European and Commonwealth trade.

We have always played a role on the international stage. We have balanced our close, friendly relationship with the United States on the one hand with a strong support for multilateral and international institutions such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade on the other.

I mentioned earlier that Ambassador Dunkel, the Director General of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, has issued a warning about bilateralism. I have now found the quotation. Ambassador Dunkel said:

The tendency towards bi-lateralism—in Trade policy is the greatest danger, both politically and economically, to order and prosperity in the world economy.

● (1730)

We agree with that viewpoint. We in the Official Opposition believe that we must reinforce the multilateral or world economic system so as to expand Canada's international trade.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. I must rule on the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Kenora—Rainy River (Mr. Parry). I must say that the amendment raises a new question. It puts forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign. Nowhere does the main motion have anything to do with free trade. It talks about softwood lumber. Therefore, I must rule against the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Monique B. Tardif (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to comment briefly on the motion before the House today, particularly on the first point concerning the Employment Support Act.