

Now, Mulroney's deal will hit even more jobs in the garment industry, and in textiles, footwear and food processing.

Under the Mulroney trade deal we will have to compete directly with larger U.S. companies which pay their workers lower wages and fewer benefits. This means that Canadian companies will be demanding lower wages from us in order to compete. Many companies won't survive.

Women, immigrants and older workers will lose the most. The industries that are most threatened by this deal are where they work.

ILGWU and New Democrats have always fought for better wages and working conditions for these workers. We will continue to fight for these jobs and industries but it'll be much tougher under the Mulroney deal.

Mulroney promised that health and social services would not be included in the deal. He lied.

The Mulroney deal will let American companies run our hospitals, ambulance services, homes for physically disabled and mentally handicapped, home care services and many other health and social services.

In the United States health care is more expensive, employs fewer staff and provides worse care. And it is run for big profits by private companies. Forty million Americans have no health care protection at all.

If they get sick they have to pay out of their own pocket for their medical treatment.

No matter how you look at it, this deal is a bad deal for women, for immigrants and for all working people and their families. It's good for big business, bad employers and the Americans.

I have heard some Hon. Members say that this is nonsense. Let us just look at one aspect of this deal. This deal provides that Canadians companies will be able to compete in the much larger American market. This also means that the American companies will be able to compete in Canada. In Canada, corporations—

Mr. McDermid: Eighty per cent is free trade now.

Mr. Orlikow: I wish the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary would sit back in his seat. He can speak again if he wants to.

In Canada, Canadian corporations pay, as part of their corporate taxes, part of the cost of hospital insurance and medical insurance plans, the Old Age Security system and the unemployment insurance plan, all of which are far superior to those that are in the United States. If we are to continue these programs, those taxes will have to be higher than the taxes American companies pay. This alone will give the American companies a tremendous advantage in producing and selling their products cheaper than the Canadian industry. That is just one illustration of what is wrong with this Bill, and that is one of the many reasons we oppose this Bill. That is also why we have moved these amendments.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested, in listening to the remarks of the Parliamentary Secretary, to hear that he somehow seems less favourable to the idea of elected Members of Parliament having a role in scrutinizing appointments to boards by the Government than appears to be the official Party policy. The Conservative Government always pats itself on the back when reference is made to reform of the rules of Parliament which allowed parliamentary committees to question appointees to a number

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

of Order in Council positions, positions which are within the executive discretion of the Cabinet.

We now have before us a set of motions which would extend this concept to appointments to various key panels and committees required to implement the dispute settlement mechanism provided for by this crucial trade deal the Government has negotiated with the United States. It was interesting to hear that the Parliamentary Secretary now seems to feel that the whole concept of parliamentary scrutiny of Order in Council appointments is somehow open to question and is on the verge of going too far.

I do not recall seeing the Parliamentary Secretary get to his feet to question the proposals which were not initiatives of the Conservative Government but which were rather a matter of all-Party agreement on reform of the rules to allow Parliamentarians through Standing Committees to question the qualifications of various Governor in Council appointments. This approach was very sound and very acceptable. Changing the rules of Parliament was a matter of all-Party agreement, but now, when it comes to the Government's trade deal with the United States, this is a concept that should not apply. According to the Parliamentary Secretary, it would mean too much work for parliamentarians. All of a sudden, what was once acceptable and in fact desirable has in fact become less acceptable and desirable when it comes to the trade deal with the United States.

I am wondering if this hesitancy on the part of the Parliamentary Secretary is not linked to a very clear fact connected with the Government's trade deal with the United States, and that is that this deal does not achieve what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said was the key objective for a trade deal with the United States. That is, the complete exemption of Canada and Canadian business and Canadian exports to the U.S. from the impact of American trade legislation.

• (1200)

We must remember that while the negotiations were under way, the Prime Minister said there was one condition, a bedrock condition, which had to be met. If it was not, there would be no trade deal between his Government and the U.S. The words that come to mind are those the Prime Minister used in an interview with the *Wall Street Journal* in which he said that Canada has to be exempted from American trade remedy laws, period. I am pretty sure that is the exact quotation. He did not qualify the condition in any way. He did not say that a partial exemption would be satisfactory. He said that Canadians would have to be exempted from American trade remedy laws, period.

Mr. McDermid: He did not say that at all.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): We know the deal the Prime Minister and the Government negotiated with the U.S. does not in any way exempt Canadians from American trade remedy laws.