

When the motion did appear in the House, it said "that this party calls on the government to support unequivocally a GATT accord that would—" and then it gives all those fine things that a GATT accord would do. It is not exactly the same. You see what happens? A press release, some people talked to the NDP, they smarten up, and then the final draft.

Do you know what happened today? No one proof-read the motion. That is what happened. And, because no one proof-read the motion, we have a motion here that calls on Canada to run away from the North American negotiations. For all I know, the deal might be a bad deal, but how will we know unless we are there?

Then also, that we should pull out of the free trade agreement.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, we know that in my riding, we lost many factories because the free trade agreement was badly negotiated. But I ask the New Democrats this: What factory in my riding will reopen if the free trade agreement is cancelled? That is a good question! I know of none, not one. Of course the few industries that may have gained would also lose with that. So we would have lost those that we had already lost and we would lose the small gains made since then. We would be losers all around. That is the New Democrats' position.

Now we have the position of the government opposite, which signs anything that the President of the United States shows them. That is the other side of the story. So here we have a free trade agreement that was signed late in 1988, if I recall. This free trade agreement was signed in a building in Washington, apparently over a meal of Kentucky fried chicken, at three o'clock in the morning by the then Minister of Finance, who had come to Simon Reisman's rescue. Despite all his finesse, Mr. Reisman had managed to bungle the whole deal.

So we have this badly negotiated agreement which contains no definition of subsidies and includes a regulatory mechanism that of course binds Canada but not the United States, a partner ten times as big as the other, with nothing to offset this disadvantage. Finally, it contains nothing to set the value of the respective

currencies, which means that as our dollar rises, we can lose as much as if a previously existing tariff was reduced.

Everything I mentioned, Madam Speaker, is what the government opposite gave us. The members on the left, the far left, want to undo what has been done without going back to what existed before, because that is impossible, and want to withdraw from the negotiations as well.

[*English*]

It could very well be that when the so-called NAFTA agreement is finished, we will not like it either. It could very well be that the government will not even like it, for all I know, although the Americans like it. Anyway, I will give them the benefit of the doubt for the moment. Not much of it, but some.

The point is, how do we know all that unless we are there at the table negotiating? How do we know that the Americans will not give away what we have when we are not there? How do we know that they will not establish policies between each other that will be a nuisance to us, unless we are there? We do not know that. That is why this motion should have been proof-read. That is why someone at the headquarters of whoever wrote this thing on the back of an envelope last night should have reread it before they put it on the word processor. That is why this is wrong.

That does not mean that we should be congratulating the government.

[*Translation*]

As I said earlier, this government has not protected the Canadian economy as it could have.

[*English*]

If I have a few minutes left, I would like to read an excerpt from a letter by a constituent, Mr. William Howieson, who sent a letter to *The Ottawa Citizen* responding to an editorial they had written on farming. Because of the very limited time, here is what he said, in part. He was comparing Canadian farmers to U.S. farmers. He said: "The 1990 New York business summary of 395 farms reveals that the total cost to produce 100 pounds of milk in the U.S. was \$15.27. The comparable figure in the 1990 Ontario Farm Accounting Project of