

Extension of Sittings

Let me say to my fellow Hon. Members and everyone at home that I only came to realize that I was truly a Member of Parliament when, during that first vote my heart pumped, the palms of my hands started to sweat, and my knees started to shake because I was about to vote on behalf of thousands of fellow Canadians. It is a privilege and responsibility accorded relatively few individuals in this wonderful country.

My role as I see it is to take part in the much envied, respected democratic process of this country. However, the Government's motion to suspend parliamentary rules, which are the very essence of democracy, has prompted me to stand here tonight and state in a clear, strong voice that the issue of the trade agreement deserves full debate. At the outset I must say that there are good, well-meaning Canadians on both sides of this argument.

Having said that, permit me to reveal some obvious facts. If the Government were building a new Canadian pipeline it would do an environmental impact study. If the Government were marketing a new product it would do a pragmatic, authentic, intensive impact study. If we were the Crazy Canuck ski team challenging for the Can-Am Cup at Whistler Mountain, British Columbia, we would never hit the slopes without checking out the course to ensure that it was fair in its layout and safe enough for all the competitors. Yet for a trade deal of historic proportions there is little evidence that the Government has costed out, with the critical eye of a truly responsible government, one, the actual demands financially, two, the actual impact socially, and third, the actual changes from province to province required to fulfil this agreement.

Let us consider the impact of this agreement, particularly Chapters Fourteen, Fifteen and Nineteen. I understand the Government did project a gain of 250,000 jobs over 10 years, about a 1.8 per cent increase in employment. However, was this before or after subtracting the job losses? That was never made clear.

It seems to me that Canada has entered a bold competitive series, much like an international hockey series. Let us call it the Can-Am Traders Cup. It is the economic match of the century. The organizers of this event, the promoters, have repeatedly announced the day of the big game. It is January 1. But many of this on this side are concerned that there seems to be no game plan for *les Canadiens*. This is beside, of course, the Americanization of the league. Now the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) says we can play with the best of them. Canadians are ready to compete, he says. Unfortunately, the puck has not even been dropped yet and the job score has the Americans out front, way out front. The

coach, the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Crosbie), has given us the pep talk, our team is warming up on the ice and, oh, there is a cheap shot: November 22, Gillette, 600 jobs; November 25, Johnson & Johnson, 16 jobs; November 25, British Footwear, 50 jobs; November 26, Pittsburgh Paints, 140 jobs; December 7, Northern Telecom, 870 jobs; and the list goes on.

• (2140)

It appears the American team has too many players on the ice. There does not even appear to be any kind of a penalty box. This certainly is a game being played under protest.

I draw the spectators' attention to Chapters Fourteen and Fifteen of this agreement, and I am not sure if the coach has read these parts yet. In particular, let us examine Article 1502 which grants temporary entry to professional people engaged in providing services. As well, let us examine, in light of Article 1502, Article 1403 which encourages the mutual recognition of licensing and certification requirements.

Both 1502 and 1403 refer to a lengthy list of professionals including scientists, dentists, psychologists, lawyers, social workers and nurses. In 1502, there is no limit placed upon the temporary status. It is a sort of permanent temporary. It can refer to one month or one year or five years.

Now, Article 1403 eliminates Canadian professional control over standards of certification and practice. These are professional aspects essential to consumer protection and safety. Consider this very real possibility. An American company implements a medical health and safety program at its plant in Hamilton. The company imports its own nurses and psychologists. Can Canadian workers be guaranteed that this health program operates with the same quality and professional authority we have come to expect from any Canadian health worker?

Some Hon. Members: Yes!

Mr. Keyes: Can we? You can guarantee that? We have it in writing in *Hansard*. Surely a responsible government must ensure that any Canadian trade legislation will safeguard its citizens against low professional standards and services. Surely this legislation must safeguard the role of professional organizations to maintain those high standards of care and certification. I want to state for the record that I cannot vote in favour of a trade agreement which puts in jeopardy high Canadian standards of certification and professional care.