

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

The Opposition is putting forth requirements that will double the work of parliamentarians, which is typical of the New Democrats. They will bog everything down with this proposed administrative cloak of the House of Commons. It is totally irresponsible. I might also point out that all regulations brought forward by Order in Council are referred to the Joint Committee on Scrutiny of Regulations. I have been involved in regulations where the Government had carried out a program incorrectly. The Joint Committee found that the regulations were wanting and reported that to the House of Commons. Those matters were changed. Why do we want to duplicate things that are already in place? That is what the Opposition is suggesting with this series of amendments Nos. 30, 32, 38, 41, 43, 44, 50, 56 and 58.

An Hon. Member: Jackpot!

Mr. McDermid: That is right, it is like a bingo game. The Opposition talks about this House making regulations. If we start getting into the House making regulations, we will never get anything accomplished.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): We may be able to understand it.

Mr. McDermid: My hon. friend from Brantford says that the public and we would probably understand better.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Right.

Mr. McDermid: I would be willing to wager that we would not. I think the system we have in place now is fully adequate and will protect any of the Opposition's concerns that they have brought forward today in the House of Commons.

I will recommend to my colleagues that they defeat this series of amendments because they are totally unnecessary and it is duplication of what is already in effect.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I support these amendments. Unfortunately, this is not the place where we can demonstrate how bad the proposed Bill is. At this time the amendments go part way to deal with some major difficulties.

I remind Members of Parliament that when the Conservative Government started to promote this deal and when questioned and challenged about it, we were promised that there would be no deal unless its dispute settlement provisions were so specific and clear that when any segment of Canadian industry, agriculture or the service sector believed that the Americans were being unfair in their competition that a tribunal would be able to make a finding which would be binding on both Canadians and Americans. What we find now is that this so-called tribunal will have to deal with any challenges brought to it but deal with them under the provisions of U.S. law. Where U.S. law is different from Canadian law, the tribunal will have to find in favour of the Americans.

I want to deal with two facets of the Manitoba economy which will be adversely affected by what this Bill does. First,

the clothing and textile industry. In my City of Winnipeg we have about 10,000 workers involved in the industry, most of whom are women. Many of them are new immigrants from the Philippines, Hong Kong and Vietnam. The industry in Canada has been and is under tremendous pressure from imports from Third World countries where the wage rate is a fraction of what it is in North America. Now, as a result of this agreement, the Canadian industry and its workers will have to compete not only with imports from the Third World but with imports from the United States.

What do people who work in the industry say about this agreement? Let me begin by putting on the record an article which appeared in March this year in the *Winnipeg Free Press*. The heading is: "Clothing factories threaten to close". The article begins by saying:

Two Winnipeg clothing manufacturers are threatening to close their operations if the federal Government does not go ahead with a package to shelter them from the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement.

Peter Nygard, President of Nygard International, and Gary Steiman, of Gemini Fashions of Canada Ltd., said yesterday the industry needs a minimum bridge of \$200 million to help it compete with larger American companies.

Without the aid, they say their businesses will be destroyed by American competition under free trade and they will be forced to close domestic operations and relocate in the United States.

I remind Hon. Members that Peter Nygard was the Chairman of the Advisory Committee this Government set up to examine the effects of the agreement on the clothing and textile industry. Peter Nygard, despite some changes in details which went a small way toward meeting his objections, has made it very clear and has been quoted in the *Financial Post* as saying that he opposes this agreement. Mr. Nygard speaks for the industry.

● (1150)

Let me put on the record the views of the unions. I will quote from a pamphlet put out by the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union. The opposition expressed by that union is the same as the opposition expressed by the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers and by other unions in the industry. This is a pamphlet which the union's Toronto office put out, but that office certainly speaks for the members in Winnipeg who have the same views. The pamphlet reads:

ILGWU and Ontario New Democrats are fighting the Mulroney trade deal.

Lower wages. Layoffs. Fewer benefits. Cutbacks on your medical care. Fewer health and social services. This is what free trade will bring to garment workers. This is why your union, ILGWU . . . say "NO" to free trade.

Prime Minister Mulroney is spending \$12 million to convince Canadians that the deal he signed with Ronald Reagan is good for us. But Mulroney isn't telling the truth about this bad deal.

The Liberals are no better. They're confused. Federal Liberal leader John Turner says he'd rip up the deal and David Peterson says he wouldn't.

It was the Liberals that opened our shoe market to more imports in 1981 and cost thousands of Canadian workers their jobs. Look what happened. Orders for Canadian-made shoes dropped, the level of imports went up and prices went up too.