

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

The government thinks it is consulting. In June, Canada's chief negotiator said that the Government of Canada would consult Canadians. However, the government has refused to allow a debate here in the House of Commons to give Canadians more information.

The *Financial Post* has information; the Mexicans have information; and U.S. senators also have information. Where is the information to which Canadians are entitled?

[English]

**Hon. William C. Winegard (Minister for Science):** Madam Speaker, the opposition has had an opportunity in committee to hear everything the minister has to say about the NAFTA. Last week we sat through a whole day debating the issues around the North American Free Trade Agreement. There is another meeting scheduled for Thursday. There are all kinds of opportunities for the opposition parties to learn what this agreement is about.

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Madam Speaker, I want to go back to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and her famous London speech where she is quoted as saying that the the minister would like to have the North American Free Trade Agreement come a little bit later because Canada is not ready for it yet.

I want to ask the minister why this government is allowing itself to be pushed into another trade deal through a quickie conference call when the minister herself admits that Canada is not ready for such a deal and that it is far too early to make any judgement upon its impact. Why are we allowing ourselves to be pushed around with somebody else's timetable?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I think this is really a silly line of questioning. I have already explained the context in which I made the remarks. I also went on to point out the great advantages to Canada that would come from a North American Free Trade Agreement, including to our telecommunications industry among others, where there is great demand in Mexico for some of the things Canada is very good at. It was well received

by the students and I think it should be well received by the House.

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Madam Speaker, in 1988 we got the same assurances that there would be thousands of jobs created in Canada. The minister in the same speech conceded that there have been major disruptions as a consequence of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

I want to ask the minister how this government can support another trade deal without knowing how many jobs would be lost. How can Canadians trust any deal this government negotiates when they know, to use the minister's words, the major disruptions that have been experienced as a result of the first trade deal it got us into?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Those are the hon. member's words, not my words.

What is important for the future is that the world is moving toward more open trading situations, including Canada, the United States and Mexico. We are doing it through the GATT round and through NAFTA, because that is where the future of this country lies in terms of jobs. We have had increased investment in this country as a result of the free trade agreement. That is going to lead to more jobs in the future. So will the free trade agreement with Mexico and the United States. Because in the 1990s we cannot bury our heads in the sand like the Liberals did for 20 years.

\* \* \*

**BREAST IMPLANTS**

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Madam Speaker, my question is to the minister of health.

Private Members' Bill C-279, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act, was debated in this House this morning. The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that people are protected from dangerous or potentially dangerous breast prostheses.

I would like to ask the minister why, if the current legislation under the Food and Drugs Act is sufficient, did it take 10 years for the government to recognize the health hazards pertaining to the Meme and the silicone gel implants and to eventually decide to remove both from the market? I would like to know why and everybody in this House would like to know why.