

different levels of partners, some more powerful than others, in a sense the administrative structure to facilitate that greater trade. I want to put it in the context, from the abstract to the reality in practice, of this particular bill in relationship, first, to the European Community and, second, to our own relationships internationally that have changed dramatically because of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

I want to focus first on the changing impact relative to this uniform system that will be altered in 1992 by the culmination of the European Community. It is commonly suggested by the government and other spokespersons for the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement that we will be in a position, accompanying this particular legislation, to be equal partners and facilitate greater trade on an equal basis so that "a stronger nation will not overcome a weaker nation", to quote the words of the hon. member.

The government likes to refer to the European Community as the model where this facilitating can take place. What the government neglects to mention is that in 1989 the European Commissioners of Social Affairs and Employment published a Charter of Fundamental Social Rights. My colleague spoke of the uniform system of rights related to this bill. This charter was intended to protect 322 million European Community citizens from any potential negative effects of the European Community becoming a single, internal market by December 31, 1992.

Mr. Speaker, you may well ask: What does this particular charter on rights, related to the government's opening statement, has to do with the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement? It certainly has in the context of the opening statement by the member about facilitating greater trade between partners of not equal strength. One of the ways of overcoming the disparity of not having equal strength is a charter accompanying the bureaucratic process that guarantees the following: first, equal treatment for men and women, a principle designed to avoid the distortions which could interfere with free competition; second, social security of migrants which facilitates the free movement of workers; and, third, vocational training, with general principles serving as guidelines for national policies.

### *Government Orders*

• (1620)

It goes on through this document, which has been prepared by the Library of Parliament and its research department, in an excellent, detailed manner showing how important it is that this kind of parallel agreement be made available when new trading blocs come together under this legislation.

As my colleague in the Liberal Party so correctly pointed out, it was long in coming forth in this House as a priority. As a matter of fact it is almost a shame that it has crowded out an even more important piece of legislation, that is the one dealing with the 60,000 Canadian families who were informed that they would be receiving their child tax credit this month. The government has not yet brought forward that piece of legislation.

That is by the by, but I wanted to comment on the valid and important point made by my Liberal colleague. In terms of describing the timing and the fact that the provinces had already caught up to this legislation before the government had, the fact is that the people out there are waiting for the tax credits. They are still being left behind, but the provinces, are leading again. That is by the by, as I say.

Turning to the main subject, this document that was produced by the Library of Parliament is a non-partisan document available to every member. Its application to this particular debate is all the more interesting, particularly when the government was forthcoming today in describing part of this bill, through the member who spoke, as a uniform system of rights.

We were told, on this process of a uniform system of rights in which this legislation embodies essentially legislative structures, that in further dealings by this government, particularly with the free trade agreement with the United States, that there would be some uniformity in terms of rights with that agreement.

We find that that is not the case. Indeed, the existing legislation signed by this government and the United States, and the forthcoming negotiations between the United States and Mexico in which this government wants to get involved, may be a violation of the very legislation that we have in front of us.

How can that be the case, Mr. Speaker? I submit that the case can be made on this basis.