

Export and Import Permits Act

It is not reasonable to allow those practices which we have outlawed in Canada, in Britain, in western Europe, generations ago, to undermine the employment opportunity or the working conditions and wages of the working men and women of Canada. Certainly it would be unreasonable to decide that Canada should return to child labour simply because a country like Thailand makes use of it.

Another country which has already made inroads into the Canadian market is Mexico and the Maquiladora strip. Two years ago this month, Adidas announced its closing of a factory of 200 employees in Toronto. When I phoned the manager, I asked the reason for it. He said: "Well, our sales are down". When I inquired more widely, I found that sales from that factory had been allowed to decline because they had opened a factory in Mexico where the wages are about one-tenth of what they are in Canada.

Again it is not reasonable, it is not patriotic, it is not socially responsible to allow workers of Canada to be thrown out of work because we are taking advantage of a situation in Mexico or Thailand or whatever in which the workers are economically pressured to work for wages like 50 cents an hour.

What I am asking for is consideration of this Bill by the committee for two purposes. One, immediately to control the extent of injury to the Canadian garment or apparel manufacturing industry. It would not take away the rights of the present importers. It would simply stop the increase of importation by people who are not also manufacturers of clothing in Canada. In other words, it would enable the clothing manufacturers who still survive in Canada to continue their production, to invest further in modernization which has certainly been continuing in the past few years on Spadina, and to maintain a garment manufacturing industry in Canada.

Second, this is a proposal that moves in the direction of an orderly sharing of the world market. Instead of simple dog-eat-dog, this is an attempt to suggest that as new technologies develop, as new producers come on the market, and as new markets come into sight, there should be the development of international arrangements for sharing that market. This is a specific proposal from the employers and the representatives of the workers in one of Canada's large industries, the second largest manufacturing industry in Canada, the largest employer of women in manufacturing. This is their request, that Parliament allow them to come to our committee and work with us on the details of this Bill. I would ask Hon. Members to vote in favour of it today.

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Madam Speaker, I have been sitting here for 20 minutes, and I am confused. I have listened to the Hon. Member from the New Democratic Party introduce his Bill which is before the House for second reading, Bill C-243, to amend the Export and Import Permits Act. He described its purpose as the encouragement of investment by Canadians and non-Canadians in domestic industries by setting limits on imported apparel. According to the Hon. Member, that

measure would contribute to economic growth and increased employment in this country. Then, for 10 minutes, he knocked all these Third World countries, their employment record and methods of hiring and firing, their assassination of union leaders, and everything else.

● (1420)

This is where the confusion comes in. Everyone knows that the NDPers have to stick by their policy manual. They are committed to it. In their 1986 policy manual, *Resolutions Reference*, Resolution B.2.4 indicates that they would:

Take the following measures to facilitate importation of manufactures from less developed countries:

- (A) Liberalize the generalized system of preferences;
- (B) Ease and eliminate the recent clothing import quotas;
- (C) Introduce no new import restrictions beyond the existing tariff levels."

That is Resolution B.2.4 in their 1986 policy manual, *Resolutions Reference*. They are also still committed to Resolution A.1.11 which says the opposite. It says:

"The NDP will pursue—the immediate protection of jobs in the industry through import restrictions."

You cannot have it both ways.

Mrs. Maily: They can. They always do.

Mr. McDermid: They try. They always try. The NDP do this all the time. When they are speaking to consumers or those with an interest in Third World countries, they say "Our policy as passed at the convention is to increase the flow of textiles and clothing from Third World countries to Canada. We have to help those Third World countries". Then, when they are speaking to manufacturers and workers, they say: "We will erect barriers to imports".

Mr. Nystrom: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I know the Parliamentary Secretary is a very able debator, and I wonder if he can tell the House from what he is quoting. There was no NDP convention in 1986. Is this one of the provincial sections of the Party? We would like to be enlightened on what section he is looking at.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): That is not a point of order. It is a point that could be debated later on.

Mr. McDermid: Boy, they get nervous over there when you start quoting their policy to them. They get very nervous. I can understand why the Hon. Member is up on his feet interfering all the time.

As I was saying, when they speak to industry they say that they will erect barriers against imports from developing countries and that that is their policy. That is why I am confused.

The Hon. Member better talk to his colleagues who put these policies together at the NDP conventions which they have all the time, where they raise their little cards and