

to increase its imports? Is the Leader of the Government not aware of special studies by the Canadian government—one of which I would be delighted to send him; I have it in my office—which show that every job that we gained exporting, we forcibly had to lose importing? So the argument that exports will improve our position in terms of jobs is not backed up by the facts not only in this country but in every other industrialized country around the world.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I would very much like to see that study, if it says what my honourable friend reports that it says. I can tell him that all of the studies that I have seen or heard about, whether they were undertaken by the Macdonald Royal Commission, the C. D. Howe Institute, or various other academic and research organizations in this country, indicate that there will be a net gain of as high as three-quarters of a million jobs from a comprehensive free trade arrangement between Canada and the United States.

Senator Gigantès: The Economic Council of Canada produced the latest of these studies in which it said that between now and 1995, if there were a free trade agreement, there would be an increase in jobs of some 370,000, which represents a yearly increase in employment of three-tenths of 1 per cent, compounded. However, I will be delighted to send you this study, Senator Murray. You may see in that study some of the figures that were obliterated from the studies which your government released about the effectiveness and the cost benefits of such a free trade agreement.

However, I have some other questions to ask that were not answered yesterday either by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister or by the honourable minister responsible for the trade negotiations. My question is: If tariffs are abolished, what happens to the Auto Pact, which operates on the basis of tariffs?

Senator Murray: The honourable senator is asking some questions that were asked yesterday and answered by ministers. If he now intends to enter into a detailed series of questions on the trade negotiations, I suggest that this is really not the time for it. Perhaps he should have the matter referred again to a committee where he could invite the ministers responsible, or perhaps the negotiators, to discuss these matters.

Senator Gigantès: Honourable senators, before the Prime Minister's speech yesterday, we were told that we would be given information. In my opinion, this is vital information. I am asking these questions because they were asked yesterday and were not answered. That is why I am asking them.

There are other aspects. The Europeans examined this issue of free trade and decided that if they have free trade, which includes the free movement of investments, there might be some investments that would move from one country to another and there might be factories or whole industries that would be moved from one country to another. The Europeans decided that the way to compensate for that danger would be to allow the people to move also.

Therefore, if a Canadian manufacturer decides to build a new plant to serve his new American market, which is ten times larger than his Canadian market, it makes sense to put that plant near his big market, which might be somewhere between Boston and Baltimore. He might then decide to shut down his Canadian plant and his Canadian workers would find themselves without jobs because they cannot follow their jobs down south. I wonder if that aspect has been considered.

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, in the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs my friend will find a very concise and excellent description of the various forms of trade agreements ranging from customs unions to common markets to the kind of comprehensive free trade arrangement that we are talking about with the United States. I commend that part of the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs—indeed I commend all three volumes of that report to my friend's attention.

The Europeans have a common market; that is not what we are negotiating with the United States.

Senator Gigantès: Honourable senators, might we not be better off negotiating a common market with the United States? Of course, we would be swallowed politically, but in that way we would ensure that our people would not lose jobs that move to Georgia where the friendly sheriff does not allow unions and where employers do not have to make contributions to health services and where the UI payments are minimal.

Senator Murray: The honourable senator is now suggesting that it might be preferable to negotiate a common market with the United States. If he really hurries, he may be able to get that suggestion included in the Turner amendment, which will be voted upon in the other place at six o'clock tonight. Everything else is in there.

Senator Gigantès: I notice that the Leader of the Government in the Senate is still not answering any questions. He is still asking us to buy a pig in a poke. I would like to relate to him the information that the Honourable Senator Frith gave to me. I thought that a pig in a poke was a pig in a pocket, or poche. It is not. Apparently, a poke is something that is put on a pig so that if it pushes against a fence, the poke pokes the pig and he or she desists.

● (1430)

I suggest that perhaps our negotiators or the government should wear such an intellectual poke when considering what may be extremely damaging to Canada. Instead of giving us waves of rhetoric, could they not give us some details about what the government is trying to do?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I assure my friend that the interests of the hog farmers will also be protected.

Senator Gigantès: There we go again! We are being treated in this house the same way as the opposition was treated in the other place. We are asking legitimate questions which have to do with the welfare of the country—questions which have to do with regions of Canada and Canadian industries that might