

political wisdom clearly foresaw the dangers, clearly understood the problems, and clearly saw the vulnerabilities that were being engaged in? What happened? Was it a hoax? Was it a big con job? Was the whole thing born in a lie? Did the present Prime Minister all along know secretly that he was going to do it, and he just was not telling Canadians the truth? I suggest that the results of 1984 would have been very different if the Prime Minister had been forthcoming and honest and stated that this is what he was going to do. I suspect that, in 1984, many Canadians would have looked much differently at the present Prime Minister and the Members he was trying to elect, for example the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the Minister of Finance, if they had stated that now they had changed their minds. Can we then assume that they were keeping it secret?

When I hear the Minister and his colleagues castigate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner), or other members of the Opposition, for what they call misrepresentations, what could be a greater misrepresentation than the words I have cited, taken to an election, and then a few months after the exact opposite being done? A change is initiated that is of glacial proportions. It will shift the geology of this country, but nobody is told about it. It is kept a deep, dark secret. What greater example of misrepresentation? What greater example of mistruth is there than that? The whole basic foundation of this agreement started with a lie, with a mistruth.

I would say that perhaps the Prime Minister knew all along what he was going to do. He knew that he could not say it in the election, because he would not be the Prime Minister, so he kept it tucked away. I believe he had different reasons. When the plan was proposed, and the Prime Minister appeared on television, it was interesting to hear the reasons why. When we judge it in the light of the present circumstances, surely Canadians must judge this agreement based upon a very hard-nosed calculus of costs and benefits. That is the bottom line for a country. It is not for a corporation, but it is for a country. Therefore, we must examine very carefully the balance between those costs and benefits. We have to ask, what are the great economic bonanzas that will fall upon us?

It is very interesting that, as time goes on, those promises shrink to the point where they are now so miniscule they are hardly talked about any more. Did we hear the Minister for International Trade use any facts and figures this morning in terms of projecting the economic benefits of this agreement? Not once did he ever comment on this type of projected growth rate or employment. He used rhetoric, but no hard facts.

It was interesting to note that, during the course of committee hearings, on several occasions when representatives of the business community appeared, they would say: "We think there will be prosperity. We hope there will be jobs. We believe there will be economic growth". I would say: "Such a statement of faith is okay for a theologian but you are supposed to be a hard-nosed business person. Give us the hard facts". They could not provide them. The reason is because there is no sure

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

guarantee. There is no magic wand that will have Canada all of a sudden move into the promised land.

• (1540)

The Economic Council of Canada, well known to be in favour of Canada-U.S. free trade, tried its best, used every possible good news criteria. Do you know what they come up with? Hold your hat, because this is going to knock you off your seat. It was a quarter of 1 per cent a year growth based on the assumption that there would be a 6 per cent productivity growth in the meantime. I asked Dr. Maxwell, the Director, in front of the committee: "What happens if you do not get the 6 per cent productivity growth and there is no guarantee? Isn't it true that there would be less growth under the Canada-U.S. trade agreement in manufacturing than there would be under the *status quo*?" Do you know what Dr. Maxwell's answer was? "Yes, that is right". If those enlarged, gargantuan predictions of productivity growth are not there, or are there only in partial terms, then we will have less growth in manufacturing under this agreement than we would have otherwise.

The jobs that they are talking about, primarily in the service sector, are lowly paid clerical jobs, again confirmed by the Economic Council. You will lose somebody in the printing industry and end up having somebody serving hotdogs at McDonald's. I am not sure that that is the right kind of trade-off that Canadians expect they are buying. I am not sure that that is the kind of economic promise that should be fulfilled.

Projection after projection, whether it is the Department of Finance or the Economic Council or Informetrica, comes up with the same conclusion, that the actual incremental growth in Canada over 10 years is marginal. Informetrica, which is an independent agency, said: "No one can argue any more about the question of whether there is more or less growth, because it is simply not there. It is hard to predict". I am not necessarily saying that there is less growth, but I will tell you that there is not that kind of great cornucopia pouring out thousands of new jobs that the Prime Minister talked about back in 1985.

Of course, what the Government did not talk about are the job losses. We have heard from the then Minister of Employment and Immigration that it could be close to 500,000 dislocated workers. Well, someone got to him and he changed his mind.

The Economic Council talks about 150,000 to 180,000. Let me give you an example of just how untrustworthy these figures are. A brief submitted by the food processors from Mr. McLean of McCain's Food predicted that in the agrifood industry, which is one of Canada's largest employers, there could be upwards of 60,000 job losses, spread right across the country. The reason is that, very clearly, the food processing industry is put in a dilemma. It cannot go ahead and buy the raw materials at the same price that the Americans can supply it. Their answer is very simple. They are going to move south. They will take their capital and move it where they can get a lower price for potatoes, chickens or whatever it may be. That