

*The Address—Mr. Blaikie*

negotiate a treaty at a table in full public view. I do not know whether he is suggesting bringing in the television cameras or putting them on a stage to negotiate. I have always found that the best way to negotiate is to do it behind closed doors with some privacy. The Hon. Member can be assured that the results of the negotiations and all reports on the negotiations are reported directly to me, and through me to the Cabinet and to the Prime Minister. I look forward, in the next few weeks, to speaking continually on this subject as I travel throughout Canada.

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister will know that if there is one thing that concerns Canadians about the trade negotiations with the United States, it is the ultimate impact those negotiations will have on their own individual personal lives and their own individual personal circumstances. It has been said that as a result of these negotiations there will be some winners and there will be some losers. I guess it is that aspect which really and truly concerns Canadians; whether those individuals will be the losers in the whole process.

It has been suggested from time to time that the Government should try to help those people who might end up in some way as losers with a program and a policy that would ease the adjustment process from the position in which they are now to what they might be in the future. Does the Government have such a policy waiting in the wings and, if so, what is it?

**Miss Carney:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) for his question. First let me reassure him that the history of the reductions in tariff barriers, for instance, that has occurred in the 50 years since the great depression certainly has shown that there are more winners than losers in trade liberalization. We are infinitely better off in 1986 than we were when the process started. I think I can reassure him generally on that point.

On his specific point about whether the Government is addressing this, yes, both countries in the trade negotiations are addressing the need to have a long-term agreement—and we are talking about from now into the next century—to phase in any changes, to have the relevant adjustment programs for those who are affected, and to have training programs for those who are affected to take advantage of the jobs that will be created. Those points are being addressed in the negotiations.

I think if the Hon. Member reflects on the training programs the Government has brought in and upon the kind of help the Government has given to industries in the area that he represents and in his province in general, he will recognize that we have a good precedent on which to stake our faith.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill):** Mr. Speaker, I will resist the temptation to try to respond to the comments of the Hon. Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) because there are several other things I had the intention of addressing today. Debate about a major initiative of the Government is very useful, and I hope there will be more

opportunities for it to happen. My intention today is to speak, first, as the spokesperson of my Party for the environment and, second, as a western Canadian who is concerned about the problems affecting that region of Canada.

In respect of the Speech from the Throne, when it comes to environmental issues, the Throne Speech is significant for what is not in it rather than for what is in it. In the Throne Speech we have the promise of a new Environmental Protection Act. That is to be welcomed. We hope that we will soon see that legislation. Presuming that it is quality legislation—and I know that a great deal of consultation has gone into it already—we will certainly be prepared to be as co-operative as we can when the legislation comes forward, of course always depending upon the fact that there are no surprises in it of which we are not aware at this time. We will be looking forward to playing a constructively critical role in that respect.

There was also acceptable rhetoric about water quality in the Throne Speech. However, I was disappointed that very shortly after the presentation of the Throne Speech, at a meeting of Ministers of the Environment, the federal Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) was not able to make new commitments to federal involvement in the much needed upgrading of our sewage treatment facilities across the country. I am told that some 53 per cent of sewage still goes into the environment completely untreated. That should be regarded as a national disgrace and should not be something which is subject to the usual kind of bureaucratic tinkering, as to whether we will have a few more dollars here or a few more dollars there. It is one of the least complicated environmental problems we face. It is less complicated than knowing what to do about invisible toxins in the Niagara River, for instance. It is something we know what to do about and something we could be doing. I fail to understand why the Government could not make a major announcement in that area. It would have been particularly helpful in areas suffering from high unemployment such as Quebec and Atlantic Canada where this kind of upgrading is most needed.

I said that the Throne Speech in respect of the environment was significant in what was left out. What was left out was a commitment to live up to the Progressive Conservative Party's campaign promise for a full inquiry into the nuclear industry. This is a promise of the Conservative Party which goes back to 1979. It is a promise that looked like it was going to be acted upon by the Conservative Government in 1979, but we all know that that Government did not have a chance to act on it. But the Conservatives have now been in office for two years. I have been after them to live up to the promise, a promise repeated in the election of 1984. Even after Chernobyl and the international meetings in Vienna, which the former Minister of Energy said would have to transpire before the Government would make its decision about an inquiry, we see no commitment to such an inquiry in the Throne Speech.