

Supply

I then go to the next point raised by the Minister who says that we have no argument, we have a two-track strategy. To paraphrase Robert Frost, those two-tracks are diverging in the woods. They are not parallel. They are going off in separate directions. When tracks go off in separate directions pretty soon the train will run off the rails. That is exactly what is happening right now. It is not possible to undertake a two-track strategy. I am reminded of the U.S. two-track strategy of arms control in Europe. On the one hand the Americans said that they would negotiate and on the other they said they would bring in Pershing missiles. We know what happened. We got the Pershing missiles but not the negotiations. This is the same problem we face here.

Simon Reisman, the chief trade negotiator, says that GATT does not work. He says it takes too long, it is too complicated and too awkward. The former Minister for International Trade, the present Solicitor General (Mr. Kelleher), says that we cannot rely on GATT. He says that it does not work, that it takes too long and that it is too awkward. We know what the two-track strategy is. On one track we have a full-blown locomotive pouring down with all its energy trying to get a bilateral agreement signed. On the other track we have a group of people tiptoeing about in their ballet slippers saying that perhaps we can get an agreement signed in the future.

When we attended the negotiations in Uruguay we spoke to people in the GATT Secretariat. We spoke to representatives from the Pacific Rim nations and to delegates from Latin America. They all said without any equivocation that if Canada signs a deal that is discriminatory against them—and how can a free trade deal not discriminate against other nations?—if we sign that deal then they will form their own regional blocs. They will make their own regional arrangements and we will be right back where we were in the 1930s with internecine guerrilla warfare going on between regional blocs of nations. Of course, GATT says that one can sign a regional agreement. However, just because it is legally right does not make it economically or politically right. When these countries see Canada heading for cover, scurrying inside a North American arrangement, that sends the message out to all other countries that the Canadians are giving up on GATT. We had better find some security blanket as well.

● (1240)

The fact of the matter is that we must provide a leadership role for international trading nations. Country after country has asked where Canada is providing leadership. The Minister said we are providing leadership in agriculture. That is not so. Leadership was provided by the Australians and Argentinians. We spent much time in Uruguay not fighting for the interests of Third World nations, not trying to provide a counterbalance to the bullying tactics of Americans but trying to get Third World nations to go along with us.

A nation cannot provide a second track if it is seen as being nothing but a sycophant of one of the largest trading partners. It must be independent. We are not being seen as being

independent but are seen as trying to cut the quickest and best deal for ourselves while abandoning the national trading system.

The reason we have raised these criticisms is that we want to show that there is a major change taking place in the global trading strategy. There are major new challenges to Canada, but we want Canada to respond in a global way, as a world trader, and not to run for cover or to cut a deal that will work against the interests of Canadian workers and the country's ability to develop a fully competitive, productive international trading strategy. That is what we want Canadians to provide.

Mr. St. Germain: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) has risen in the House today along with his coalition partners in the NDP to preach fear, negativism and pessimism and to try to scare Canadians. If this country had been run by men and women like those who represent the Liberal Party and the NDP today, we would still be sitting on the edge of the St. Lawrence River. We would never have built a railway across Canada.

I find it very surprising that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry would try to defend British Columbia and Alberta when he sold them down the river with the national energy policy. He was one of the designers of that program. It is a shame.

The Hon. Member spoke of the shake and shingle industry. Eight-five per cent of that industry is in my riding. The Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount (Mr. Johnston) and the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) did not know what their positions on logs, bolts and blanks should be. Jobs would have been destroyed had we not put the exportation limitations on cedar at that time. The Hon. Member is now saying that we did nothing.

The Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) showed leadership on the shake and shingle issue, but members of the Opposition said that he over-reacted. When I asked that restrictions be put on the exportation of cedar logs, bolts and blanks, they were put on immediately. That was the leadership our Government showed. It preserved the jobs in the shake and shingle industry. Certainly we lost a few but we preserved most of the jobs and today the Americans want to remove the tariff.

The Macdonald Commission, the BCNI, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and the Chamber of Commerce have advocated proceeding with a free trade deal. Mr. McGuinness, the new President of the Chamber of Commerce, said that we have no choice, we must proceed. He said that those who choose not to proceed with free trade will be walking with the turkeys while those who choose to proceed will be soaring with the eagles. I would like to know the Hon. Member's reaction to the position taken by these major organizations along with Jack Munro of the IWA. He said that we must proceed with free trade negotiations immediately.