

In the early part of this year, the Prime Minister took a campaign of insults against the Opposition across the country. Now he is beginning to go across the country saying that his neck is on the line and he is prepared to fight the next election on this issue. We have seen quite a reversal in approaches.

Second, the basic argument which the Government attempted to sell to Canadians at the beginning of the discussions was that Canada would escape from countervail proceedings, if not permanently then at least while this set of negotiations was going on. Last summer I can remember witness after witness coming before the special committee that looked into free trade saying that at least we would be freed of countervail actions during the negotiations. In fact, that veil has been thrown to the winds as well. We found that rather than being freed of countervail actions, we have become even more the focus of countervail actions, countervail actions on steel, fish and now lumber.

Third, the Government told Canadians that the whole issue of free trade is about getting lower tariffs for Canadians. So far, what have the consequences been? I would ask Hon. Members to ask themselves how our tariff situation today compares with that of a year ago. The United States now has much higher tariffs on shakes and shingles, fish and specialty steel parts. Here in Canada, we put into place higher tariffs on books, computer parts, teabags and even Christmas trees. Again there has been a massive contradiction between the strategy which, it was promised, would reduce tariffs and the reality which is that tariffs have increased.

The fourth veil of this great strategy was that free trade talks would help the regions. Again, the regions have been hurt most desperately by the changes that have taken place. Central Canada has not been hit nearly as hard as the fishing industry in the West and the steel industry and wheat producers on the Prairies. The wheat producers are now faced with U.S. actions to subsidize exports of wheat.

The dance continued with the words of the Prime Minister. I am convinced that until I finish my days on earth, the day will stick indelibly in my mind when the Prime Minister rose, with a toughness we have not heard since John Diefenbaker, to attack the United States for a lack of notice for something that was unacceptable and appalling in its impact on Canada. Ten days later, however, the Prime Minister wrote: "Dear Ron, what I was really concerned about was my personal reputation and my political reputation. After all, our personal reputations will survive these minor occurrences".

If the dance had finished at that stage, it would have been exciting enough for all of us who were watching, but it is going on. Every day, the dance seems to take a new reversal and a new veil is thrown to the wind. Instead of the Government being after this, it is now after that.

For instance, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when I first raised the question of using the Employment Support Act to support workers in the lumber sector in British Columbia on March 26, said to us that that would be terrible

Supply

and would be seen as using threats against the United States. He said he did not believe in that kind of thing. Last night, on CTV's *Question Period*, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said precisely what we asked him to say six weeks ago. He said that the Employment Support Act would in fact be used.

Finally, I have to talk about the emperor in the dance of the seven veils. I have to talk about the Prime Minister who has, up to now, talked about getting fast-track freer trade talks going with the United States. Suddenly this weekend he threw that veil to the winds and said that is not what we want, what we want is something just like the Auto Pact, right down to its safeguards. He said we want a hydro pact for Quebec, a fisheries pact for Atlantic Canada, a mining pact and a steel pact. It was such a total reversal in position that I think the term "U turn" coined for Margaret Thatcher in Britain will have to be turned into "corkscrew turn" for our Prime Minister.

• (1150)

The Government has pursued these policies with total ineptitude. I fear we could talk about that ineptitude with particular sarcasm in respect of the shakes and shingles case and the softwood lumber case. Last week we saw the Prime Minister refusing to pick up the telephone to phone the President of the United States about softwood lumber, and we heard the weak excuses of the Secretary of State for External Affairs on Friday about that failure. However, somehow out of this has come, ironically, something we as a House might not have expected. It is something which in fact, if one believes what the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs were saying over the past weekend, gives some prospect of progress ahead of us.

Our Party has taken a consistent position throughout the entire debate. We have said that we favour trade concern and trade expansion with the United States through safeguards associated with sector based deals just as in the Auto Pact. We have also said that we favour a trade dispute mechanism which would attempt to work with both sides to try to give us some kind of future in which we could work out disputes before they become crises. We have said that the Employment Support Act should and could be used to help our people when necessary. We have said that there cannot be the comprehensive, free trade, fast-track exercise which they are trying to go through in the United States.

Today we issue a challenge to the Government. We challenge it to live up to the rhetoric of the past weekend and to put its trade policy in the very rhetorical terms which were used over the weekend. Our first challenge to the Government would be to come to the House of Commons and make it absolutely clear that the mandate which it is seeking to talk with the United States is related to a series of sectoral deals with safeguards associated with each of the deals just as in the