

Free Trade

lost. Why else would the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) have talked, in the very period after the trade deal was originally announced, about massive adjustment help for workers who would be hurt by this deal? Of course, it is possible that the Prime Minister was just talking through his hat, but I prefer to think that he was expressing some concern about the thousands of people whose jobs would in fact be lost because of this deal.

Why has the Minister of Employment talked of up to 500,000 jobs being lost if that is not the case?

Mr. McDermid: Why don't you quote him accurately?

Mr. Langdon: That is precisely what he said, and that is precisely what the people of Canada heard him say on television.

If these thousands of jobs are not to be lost, why is it that groups came before the committee talking about such job losses? B.C. fish processors reported to us that they expected to lose 6,000 to 8,000 jobs because of the way GATT was put into the free trade agreement. Prior to that, GATT was something with which one could negotiate and, in the end, if one actually felt that the position put forward was unreasonable, one could reject it. Under this deal, that is no longer possible.

B.C. fruit and vegetable growers told the committee that they would be wiped out. Grape growers from across the country told us that 20,000 jobs would be lost in that industry alone. The Council for Yukon Indians testified that they would lose out because they felt that the end of local hiring would follow upon the deal and they expected environmental damage. It is possible that the Minister may not be interested in what the Council for Yukon Indians said, but that is what the council said.

The Canadian Independent Computer Services Association, which is based in Winnipeg, Manitoba, testified that as a result of this deal, it is likely that 360,000 jobs would be shifted out of Canada in the next 10 years. The Government may not like these figures, but that is what the committee heard when it crossed the country.

The auto parts producers have now rejected this deal and expect that some 20,000 to 40,000 jobs will be lost. The printers' association testified before the committee in Fredericton, New Brunswick, that it expected to lose 6,000 jobs.

These are not, as the Government likes to pretend, trade unions coming to talk to the New Democratic Party. These are business and farm groups coming before a committee of the House of Commons giving very clear testimony with respect to the thousands and thousands of jobs which, from their expertise, they foresee as necessarily being lost because of this agreement.

It is not just job losses. As shifts from this country of enterprise to the anti-union southern states, the low-wage states of the South or the Maquiladora Corridor of Mexico

take place, we will see that wages and working conditions for workers in Canada will be affected. The competition will be used by business people here to try to force down wages and reduce working conditions.

Beyond jobs, we also saw investment being thrown out of the window. The controls which had existed to this point over takeovers of Canadian companies of over \$5 million in assets were thrown out of the window. We saw controls over indirect takeovers thrown out of the window. Again, there will be tremendous consequences as a result of that.

● (1640)

Let me refer to a United States report which attempted to outline what was happening in this deal. They said quite clearly: "The real achievement of this agreement is that henceforth the vast majority of new U.S. investments will occur with no interference from the Canadian Government."

What does it mean in practice? For instance, as happened in my constituency recently, an American company will be able to take over a Canadian-owned company and simply shut it down for competitive reasons. There will be absolutely no recourse on the part of the Canadian Government, unless that firm has over \$150 million in assets, which accounts for about 300 out of the thousands of companies in this country.

We can go on to deal with energy and resources. It seems that the Government does not want to hear what we say, so let me quote people who testified to us as we went across the country. Joseph Mercier, the owner of an oil exploration company in Alberta, said: "Instead of going into battle with Ontario for Alberta's rights, are we going to try to allocate the authority to some administrator in Washington?" He went on to say: "The National Energy Board will no longer be able to say anything about our natural gas, but there will be people in the Federal Energy Resources Commission in the United States, there will be people in Washington, who will tell us what we can do with our natural gas". That is what we heard from oil people in Alberta.

We heard the same thing from the small-scale explorers' association in Alberta, who would not endorse this deal because they also saw it as a completely unbalanced, one-way exercise which gave far more to the United States than to us.

We can discuss cultural control. We heard magnificent testimony from a person in Prince Edward Island who had taken the plunge and moved from central Canada to try to establish a small scale enterprise in Prince Edward Island. He found considerable difficulty in establishing that enterprise, but nevertheless has persisted and succeeded in making it economically viable. Let me quote Jack McAndrew, from our hearings in Charlottetown. He said: "I, like every other Canadian producer, have spent most of my adult life fighting for a stall in the market of my own country".