

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

to have any ambition beyond being enveloped in the American cocoon.

We will be watching to see if the Government has a trade agenda for Canadian entrepreneurs who want to go not just to Pittsburgh but to Panang, who want to go not just to San Diego, but to Sao Paolo.

We will be watching to see what new steps the Government is prepared to take in terms of R and D and procurement policy to ensure that Canada's manufacturing base is not hollowed out and given away.

We will be watching the dispute settlement mechanism to see if it evolves beyond the Congress' rubber stamp into a truly bi-national body that serves the interests of both countries.

We will ask that the Government not allow the Americans to simply apply American law and American practice to our exports. When Congress refuses, we will ask of the Government why it signed the deal in the first place.

Finally, we will ask about plant closings. Every day the Government denies any linkage with the Free Trade Agreement. Does it not understand that due to the rationalization of industry in the United States the burden of change will be and is being felt primarily by the Canadian subsidiaries of American companies and that this agreement has eliminated much of the protection we previously had?

During the debate the Government kept pointing to the agreement and saying nothing in it touched our social programs when the problem was that there was nothing in it to protect them. The fact is that there is nothing in this agreement that allows us to prevent closings such as Gillette's. There is nothing in this agreement that would allow us to do as the French Government did when Gillette sought to close their plant in Ance. That is the problem. Canadians have been misled in this agreement and anyone who has been in the business world more than five minutes understands it. That is why—

**Mr. McDermid:** Oh, come on.

**Mr. Martin (Lasalle—Émard):** Within two days of the signing of this agreement, chief executive officer after chief executive officer admitted that our social programs are in jeopardy—

**Some Hon. Members:** False.

**Mr. Martin (Lasalle—Émard):** —because of the need to harmonize with the United States. If Members opposite deny it then they are simply demonstrating that they may well have been clerks in the business world but never had to make a decision in their lives.

**Mr. McDermid:** Be careful. You are not the only businessman in the House.

**Mr. Martin (Lasalle—Émard):** I ask Members opposite: Why do they deny facts that the whole business world knows are true?

**An Hon. Member:** Get serious.

**Mr. McDermid:** There are a lot of business people in this House. You are not the only one.

**Mr. Martin (Lasalle—Émard):** I have not seen very many. I spent a long time in the business world. Let me say that I have not seen any of the Members opposite anywhere.

You do not have to be a businessman and have a lack of compassion. The business community has it and understands it. It may well be that the businessmen who do not have compassion become Tory Members of Parliament.

Where are the worker adjustment programs? Where are the policies and strategies to deal with the thousands of Canadians who have lost their jobs? The answer is that there are no such programs. If Members opposite think there are, they ought to go to the streets where the Minister of homelessness has put the people who have lost their homes to find out.

[*Translation*]

The problem will not disappear simply because the Minister or the Conservatives refuse to admit it exists. If the Conservatives think that existing programs are adequate with or without free trade, they should go to my constituency and tell it to the 2,000 people who have lost their jobs since 1984.

**An Hon. Member:** The employees of Voyageur!

• (1620)

[*English*]

Would you like a bus pass?

**Mr. Blais:** No, no.

**Mr. Martin (Lasalle—Émard):** Well, we wouldn't allow certain people on. We really do have standards.