

*Supply*

toward greater protectionism. This alternative would present a serious threat to our economy . . .

And a little further, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

... there still remain out-standing issues involving bilateral trade relationships between Canada and the United States.

... we remain hopeful that a number of these issues between us can be resolved to the mutual benefit of both countries.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said that in 1972.

In January 1986, however, he changed his position. He said, for instance, that he felt it would be very dangerous to isolate ourselves from the rest of the world through bilateral negotiations with the United States. In 1972 he said the exact opposite.

In fact, he went on to say in the same speech that we should start talks with the United States and see how we could expand access to our respective markets.

Mr. Speaker, this is inconsistency in its purest form. It is particularly apparent from what the Leader of the Official Opposition says when asked for the Liberal Party's position on this issue. One minute he says he would like to tear up the Agreement and the next that maybe we should see whether we cannot reach an agreement of some kind. That is the typical Liberal position, Mr. Speaker. Clear as mud.

And now back to our NDP friends. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the New Democratic Party has always been opposed to free trade. Why? In 1970, the Leader of the New Democratic Party wrote in his book, *The Liberal Rip-Off*, and I quote: "In my view, we should gradually get rid of that moral fantasy we call capitalism." He goes on to say: "Free will and free enterprise are all part of the same myth."

Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty clear statement of the philosophy of the New Democratic Party and how it applies to the development of our businesses, job creation by the private sector, and the production mechanisms developed by the private sector. Mr. Speaker, to them it is worthless. Absolutely worthless. They want no part of it. They do not want Canadians to make their own business decisions. They do not want Canadians to be so productive and ingenious and competitive that they can take an active part in our economic growth, create jobs and finally Mr. Speaker, take their rightful place on international markets. Mr. Speaker, the position of the NDP is this: no to capitalism, no to private enterprise, and yes to trade unionism. The New Democrats would nationalize everything. If they did, who do they think would want to invest in Canada? Could they tell me for what possible reason a Canadian with no say in such a policy would want to invest in Canada for the sheer satisfaction as a Canadian of creating jobs, of making sure that Canada progresses and the unemployment rate in this country remains at a more acceptable level, compared to the 15 or 18 per cent it reached under the Liberals. Such is the policy of the New Democratic Party.

Before considering the pros and cons of the free trade issue, one must consider who are those opposed to it, what they do,

what they have done and what they would be likely to do if they were in a position of power as the Government having to deal with this issue. We are dealing here today with one of our Government's initiative. In 1984, the Prime Minister announced that he was firmly committed to creating permanent jobs and putting an end to protectionism which, by the way, is causing the financial situation to deteriorate even further.

When we look at the Opposition parties who are dead set against free trade, we get the impression that they do not realize that Canada is a net exporter in need of foreign markets to thrive, whose economic activity must expand far beyond its frontiers to preserve existing jobs, to ensure technological progress and to go forward with new concepts and new investments.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at our Canadian exports, we realize that 80 per cent of those going to the United States benefit from a free trade situation. Both opposition parties are saying: We must not deal with the Americans. Absolutely not! They are going to invade us, they will deprive us of our cultural sovereignty and as individuals, of our Canadian identity. They will abolish the Auto Pact. They will pass all kinds of protectionist measures against us. They will have us scrap our marketing systems for farm products.

Mr. Speaker, I think that both Opposition parties are inconsistent when they say such things, because if we look at the mechanism provided for in the trade agreement, we see that from the very start we have set up a committee. We have set up a committee on free trade and both parties opposite have been asked to take part in those proceedings. We asked the Liberal Party and the NDP to sit with us. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to Canadians that both parties systematically refused to sit with us, to discuss the problems which could have raised some concerns and which they could have pointed out. They would rather go before the public and say all sorts of things without knowing what they are talking about and so today Canadians are undecided about the advantages and disadvantages of free trade since they were never implied at that level.

Mr. Speaker, at the very start, we set up a trade negotiations office made up of experienced men and women who were asked to organize and carry out the negotiations. Afterwards, we set up with the provinces a standing committee on negotiations whose purpose was to hold briefings with provincial trade representatives. We met practically every month. We also met regularly with the Advisory Committee on International Trade chaired by Walter Light as well as with 15 other advisory groups representing the entire Canadian industrial community.

We have done our utmost to keep them informed about any progress and have asked them their views on matters which more directly concerned them.

When those mechanisms were set up, Mr. Speaker, our negotiators initiated the talks and this was in May 1986.