

implementation. Is there anything subversive in that? Is there anything designed to place dynamite under Parliament by asking that there be a parliamentary committee established to monitor and watch over what is taking place? We had evidence today of why it was necessary. The Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) said he was not sure that the negotiations on subsidies would be successful. Surely we have a right to understand why, to have officials come forward to set out their concerns and parameters. The only response we heard back was that they could send it to one of the standing committees.

Let me pass on my experience in those standing committees with a government majority. Last summer the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade was seized with the examination of Bill C-130. When we put forward a motion to ask that the committee be allowed to travel throughout Canada in order to give Canadians the opportunity to make their case, it was voted down by that majority. That is what this Government wants us to trust, a majority on the committee that knows no restraint and simply follows the bludgeoning hammer designed to run legislation through.

That is why we felt it was essential that there be a committee with a stated mandate as part of the legislation. That is not so unusual. We have done it with the intelligence security committee where we had a mandate. We have always provided an assurance that on something as important as this there would be an opportunity to be heard. That was accompanied by another amendment that there be a form of sunset clause, that after three years this Parliament be seized with the full scope of the agreement and be allowed to judge its impact, ramifications, and consequences for Canadians.

We heard the Minister for International Trade this morning wax incomprehensibly. He tried during his presentation to indicate that there were going to be benefits. That is a judgment call. He ended his comments by saying that the committee should be allowed to judge. Let us take that at face value. If they are going to be allowed to judge, then they need to have facts upon which to make a judgment. The only way they can get facts is if Parliament has an Opportunity to examine those issues and determine whether the agreement is working the way the Government said it would.

There is nothing in this amendment that in any way subverts the legislation. It makes it better. It gives Canadians an opportunity to be heard. It ensures that

Parliament will be the ultimate judge as to whether this agreement is working.

I say to the Conservative Members of Parliament, to the back-benchers, do you see something highly treasonable in that particular amendment? Is it so bad that the Government had to bring in closure to prevent us from bringing it to the floor of the House? Is there something so iniquitous about Parliament looking at this important agreement that would motivate the Government to use Draconian measures to prevent any debate whatsoever? Any fair-minded person would have to say no.

Here are other examples of amendments that are important to submit. There is an amendment which said that under Clause 4, for greater certainty, nothing in this Act or agreement would preclude the continuation of existing or the establishment of new adjustment programs to help firms and workers adjust to the changing results from the implementation of the agreement. Horrors! Imagine the nerve of the opposition putting forward an amendment that Canadians have the right to choose whether they will help workers or communities that are dislocated by this agreement? Is that not an awful thing to do? Is it not terrible that this will not see the light of day on the parliamentary table because it was so contrary to the spirit of the agreement?

There is awfully good evidence as to why it is necessary. We have seen it in front of us today. Colleagues of mine have brought to the Speaker's attention a series of dislocations already taking place. My friend from High Park has already talked about a factory in his riding. My friend from Winnipeg North Centre has had Canada Packers close down in his riding. We have the horrible example given by the Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) and the close of the Gillette plant. Those are examples. They are *prima facie* evidence.

Of more concern is the underlying fallacy in the argument of the Government that this agreement will create so many jobs that we will have no need for adjustment programs. That has been the defence they have been using. Let me counter that with a couple of specific points. First, the Macdonald Royal Commission which, in a sense, fathered or mothered this agreement, whichever term one would like to employ, said that essential to any trade agreement with the United States would be a massive undertaking of adjustment programs. Do you know why it said that? It is because in testimony before the Macdonald Royal Commission, one Simon Reisman, the mouth that walks, had suggested clearly that if we were to sign an agreement with the