

the paragon of all Canadians, and sang on national television, only to be raped many weeks later.

I should like to refer to the conduct and behaviour of our Prime Minister, of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) who is not in his place, and of the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Kelleher). Your conduct, Mr. Speaker, is much wiser than theirs. I find those three Hon. Ministers to be not only negligent but grossly negligent in representing the best interest of Canadians now and in protecting, ensuring, and embellishing upon our possible economic benefits in the future. They have taken the ball on free trade. They have dropped it. They have fallen over the ball. They have picked it up and they have dropped it again. They have thrown it to both sides. They have thrown it backward. They fell into the puddle. They are all over the map. We are showing our American friends and the world on the international stage that we are incompetent. What effect does that have on our reputation as a foreign sovereign nation? Who is leading the charge? It is the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada. That is the problem with the negotiations.

At the outset I said that my colleagues in the New Democratic Party perhaps intended to have the word "incompetence" included in their motion. That is the intention of the amendment. I rest my case by saying that when Hon. Members opposite rise to question opposition Members, they should remember what they have done for workers in British Columbia. What will happen on June 6, 1986? As one of my colleagues said earlier, the answer is *res ipsa loquitur*.

**Mr. Chuck Cook (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, Bob Thompson, who was a Member of the House of Commons for the area of Red Deer for a number of years, made a statement once to the effect that the Americans are our best friends whether or not we like it. That statement is as true today as it was in the sixties when he made it. When we talk about free trade, enhanced trade, or freer trade, we should keep that in mind.

The subject of enhanced trade with the United States has been selected often by the Opposition for debate in the House lately. I welcome the opportunity provided by the Opposition to explain again and again and again that the world is changing and that Canada wants and needs to be part of that change.

To put it simply, Canada cannot sit on the sidelines of evolving world trading patterns and then at some moment in the future turn around and say: "Stop the world, we want to get on". Canada must move first and fastest if we are to protect our markets outside our own boundaries.

Let us not for a moment be deluded into thinking that other nations are not eyeing the American market. All countries of the world are eyeing the American market. Unless we do everything we possibly can to protect ourselves and to ensure our share of that market, we could be in very serious trouble. Any vacancy or void that Canadians may leave will be filled by others throughout the world. We must fight back if we are to

### Supply

protect the jobs of Canadians involved in the creation of products and services for export. One out of every four jobs in Canada depends upon export trade. The Government is not being casual about the matter; we are being causal. We want to cause things to happen in trade.

Let me explain the trade talks perhaps in simpler language by referring to an analogy which may make it easier to understand. I will use simple business terms. Let us suppose that a company has a number of customers, one of which is the largest and takes three-quarters of the company's production. Let us also suppose that the company wants to expand. It may be for any one of a number of reasons. Generally speaking, all companies want to expand. Perhaps it is a generation of the family who wants to expand. In any event, that expansion will create more jobs. What should the company do? First, it will launch a sales campaign to sell more product. It will do something else of equal importance, that is, it will talk and talk with its major customer, the one who is taking most of its product. The company will do everything in its power to guarantee continued business with its large, number one customer. A small percentage fall-off in sales to the larger customer could wipe out the value of the total sales to many smaller customers.

This business approach has been described many times in many meeting rooms, seminars, class-rooms, and boardrooms. Good grief, I have done it myself. Most often it is summarized with the old expression, a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. In this case the bird in hand is the American eagle, and I must add that there has never been an eagle yet that can handle a healthy beaver.

So it is with trade between countries. When a country has a number one customer, it does everything reasonable and profitable to keep that customer's business. In the case of Canada, our big customer is the United States. Indeed we would be foolish if in any program of export growth we did not attempt to protect our business with our most important customer. If we do not protect that business, then we will work years to replace even a small part of any losses in our sales to the United States.

● (1540)

Now we come back to the company I talked about. When that company decides it wants to guarantee, or at least protect, its sales to the number one company, what does it do? Practically everybody does one thing. You go out and talk to that customer. You find out how things are going. How are prices? What deals would help sales, and so on. The important thing is that the company sits down with the customer and talks about future sales. What can be done that will benefit, and I emphasize will benefit, both parties? How can a continued business relationship be beneficial to both? Those are the subjects they discuss, and so would Canada and the United States. We must talk to our best customer to see what things we can do together that will make our future business dealings more useful to both of us. That only makes common