

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Belsher:** Hey, you're reaching.

**Mr. Barrett:** I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am perfectly relating my comments to what the member said. He gave the three principles, and I am dealing with those principles particularly in relation to the greater equity of trade.

On the basis of the greater equity of trade, if we look forward to this kind of charter in the European Community, there was an impression left, perhaps falsely or unwisely by this government, that the same kind of protections would be available in a Canada-U.S. agreement and perhaps would even be the subject of further discussion under the UN charter of the trade deal among Mexico, Canada and the United States.

I ask these questions: Is there any protection in the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement that compares at all with the social dimension in the EC? Not one whit. Yet, some spokespersons for the government—too long a list for me to name—go around in public exposing themselves to the default in the agreement that indeed there is no social charter, and the promises made by the Prime Minister for the kind of equality in terms of the best social programs were never entrenched in legislation.

I know that that comes as a shock to you, Mr. Speaker. We even had the de Grandpré commission give a report. That commission was required to give a report by this government, with the aura that out of its report greater dimensions of services would be available for anyone who was displaced in this new trading bloc.

What happened to the de Grandpré report? Do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? We in this House were all told, as we debated this bill, that the de Grandpré report would establish for Canada and the United States all of the mechanism necessary as the best international program in dealing with people who suffer because of new trading blocs. We are debating this dimension of the trading blocs, yet every one of the suggestions in the de Grandpré report, every demand for some equality based on the argument that went on, has been left out.

We have this pious statement by the government that we are now moving, as the government spokesperson said, to a uniform system of rights. I took notes of what he said. He read his speech. He also said facilitation of

trade and greater equity in trade. Reading the bill is one thing, but hearing the words of that speaker is another. When I heard what he was saying, I knew very well that the government was hoping for a quiet afternoon to allow this bill to go through, without looking exactly at its own obligation under this bill.

I would like to pose this question to you, Mr. Speaker, because you understand this more clearly than anyone else in this Chamber. I have your rapt attention in this regard. Should another member wish to listen to what our conversation is, I hope these pearls of wisdom do not fall on empty ground. Having said that, as we move toward a trilateral discussion between Mexico, Canada and the United States, the whole motive behind the move is for a low wage partner. The Government of Canada is pandering to the large corporations that want us Canadians to lose jobs to low-paying wages in Mexico.

If the government were serious about this matter, it would not in any way threaten any Canadian jobs with unfair competition with low cost Mexican labour. It would say under this bill that it intends to facilitate and guarantee that we will play on a level playing field, but not at all. Even under this bill there is no attempt to protect Canadian jobs, working standards, the environment, or health.

**Mr. Belsher:** Have you read the bill, Davey?

**Mr. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, the member asks if I have read the bill. I have studied this bill in depth. I was shocked and disappointed that there was not even a response or a nod from the fact that the Liberal Party spokesman was right on the ball in terms of the time delay.

I am extending the Liberal Party's argument by saying not only is there a time delay, but there is a work delay by this government as it continues to sell our Canadian working men and women in free trade agreements and trilateral talks it may take with Mexico. It is a denial of the existence of this bill to have some equity that that member spoke about.

How can you have equity if you have agreed, on the one hand, to a free trade agreement that destroys Canadian jobs? How can you have equity, on the other hand, if you agree to trilateral talks with Mexico and try to compete with the Maquiladora program where Mexican workers are paid \$3.61 a day for jobs that are