

our U.S. counterparts may revise and/or strengthen at any time, now or in the future.

Under this provision Canadians are linked to U.S. trade law. I suggest that Canadians do not want to be tied to American law and thus the amendment proposed by my Party is a reasonable and constructive proposal which the Government should consider. It has not done so.

The third weakness in the foundation of this agreement, in my view, is that it commits Canada to negotiations over the next five to seven years to define the definition of subsidies. How can anything so uncertain lead to stability?

The Government of Canada expected the Members of this House, and indeed the people of this nation, to sign an agreement that does not contain set definitions.

I would ask the members on the government side if they would purchase a house and have the lot size determined later, or perhaps purchase and pay for a new car and have the dealer later decide on the model, make, and colour. I do not think it is unrealistic to say that no intelligent individual would enter into such an agreement. Why would the Government of Canada expect Canadians to sign an agreement that contains no definition of such a contentious topic as a subsidy?

The Prime Minister had, as one of his intentions, that a free trade agreement with the United States would provide certainty and stability to the Canadian economy. To this proposal I say bravo. However, as the Bill now before us stands, it requires polishing by way of amendment to provide the utmost certainty.

We know this Bill will pass at approximately 1.15. But what is so frustrating and irritating is that we have put forward literally a bookful of amendments which this Party believes would be helpful in protecting the concerns of Canadians. Those amendments have simply been totally ignored by the government side. Is the Prime Minister not big enough to accept the amendments or at least some of them proposed to the House? No. Instead, he allows himself to be outnegotiated and refuses to correct his mistakes or even admit them.

The true nature of this agreement was deliberately hidden from the Canadian people. The Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Turner) pointed this out during the election campaign. Now we are seeing first-hand the Government's attempt to blur the true focus of this debate by holding hostage this legislative

#### *Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

Chamber right up until literally the day before Christmas and by constantly invoking closure to limit debate and constructive criticism.

In my view, this is a poor example of democracy. An excellent example of democracy is that of the election results in Scarborough West, where the Progressive Conservative incumbent met defeat by a margin of almost two votes cast against him for every one cast for him. The people of Scarborough West issued a stinging rebuke of this agreement. As their representative, I have the privilege and the duty to deliver their message to the House.

Government Members have been quick to point out what they perceive as the virtues of this agreement. Yet, as the deal comes under closer scrutiny, the risk far outweighs the return. Original employment projections by the Economic Council of Canada have been drastically reduced to the point where it is now projecting estimates of 250,000 jobs newly created by the year 1998. That is an impressive figure, no doubt, at first glance, but one must understand that, to achieve this figure, manufacturing productivity must increase by 3.6 per cent per year.

Is the Prime Minister trying to tell Canadians that they do not work hard enough already? If productivity does not increase, then the Economic Council predicts that an increase of only 76,000 new jobs may be possible over a 10-year period. That is what we have given up.

Contrast this to the projections of a study done by the University of Maryland which states that Canada could very well experience a loss of up to 131,000 jobs by 1995 under the trade deal. This projection is not difficult for me to believe as we have already seen mass lay-offs at several plants across this nation. To date, if the figures have not grown since yesterday, over 1,800 Canadians have been laid off. It will not be a very merry Christmas for some.

• (1930)

During the election campaign, the Government told Canadians that this agreement would save every household \$800 a year in consumer expenses. That sounded like a very attractive offer. However, the Government did not tell Canadians that this suggested saving is calculated on items that are very, very infrequently purchased, such as refrigerators, stoves, air conditioners and the like. The Consumers Association of Canada disagrees with this estimate. It insists that individual savings are not likely to exceed one-tenth of 1 per cent of a person's annual income. Surely this