

Extension of Sittings

• (1800)

In other stories published in the last few days of the campaign it also made clear that any idea that the binding dispute mechanism would be binding or have any teeth to it was also an argument that was thrown out of the window. There was nothing of either kind. If we did not get either of those two things then what did we get from this deal?

In 1983, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) knew exactly, and he forecasted absolutely correctly what would be happening today, and what has already happened to some 2,400 Canadians, under free trade when he stated:

"We'd be swamped. We have in many ways a branch plant economy in certain important sectors. All that would happen with free trade would be the boys cranking up their plants throughout the United States in bad times and shutting their entire branch plants in Canada. It's bad enough as it is."

It is bad enough as it is, Mr. Speaker, and it is just that bad now. The Prime Minister's forecast was absolutely accurate in this regard. What he forecast would happen is now happening. After the results of the last election the corporations involved in these practices now have no doubt that this deal is going to go through, they are going to get what they want, and in the Prime Minister's words they can now "crank up their plants throughout the United States . . . and shut their entire branch plants in Canada". These are the process that has started.

If the Prime Minister knew back in 1983, that that is what was going to happen, then why does he not have some plans in place to ensure that those Canadians who have or will be cast out on the street have some significant protection? Members opposite have been asking, why should one group get favourable treatment in relation to another group that is laid off, or had their plants closed down? Well, all Canadians who are subject to mass plant closures should have protection. However, there is a particular incumbency upon any government, whose own actions are responsible in a very direct way for such closures, and it should adopt special measures to ensure that there is as little sacrificing as possible in terms of the incomes and the means of livelihood of those workers who, as a direct result of its policies, have been cast out on the street.

In conclusion, I would like to draw attention to some remarks made by Remi J. De Roo, Roman Catholic Bishop of Victoria. During the debate on this subject very little has been said about some of the wider implications of this deal. In a section of his treatise entitled *Free Trade and Global Disparities*, from a

presentation to the Summit Citizens Conference in June, 1988, he stated in the section entitled "Economic Militarism":

"Secondly, Canada prides herself on being a nation committed to global peace and nuclear disarmament. Yet, the creation of a North American trade bloc will further consolidate the links between Canada's economy and the U.S. military industrial complex in a global war economy.

Take article 907. It serves to tie Canada's energy exports (oil, gas, uranium) more closely to the U.S. military production priorities. If the U.S. runs short of energy needed for military production purposes, then Canada's energy sources will be made readily available. What this means, in effect, is that Canada's role in promoting nuclear disarmament will be further restricted and compromised by our role as an energy supplier for the U.S. military machine."

If one looks at what has happened to uranium production and the marketing of uranium in the years 1981 to 1986, a good portion of which time is under the regime of the Conservative Party, and a good part of it also was under the Liberal Party before it, one sees that Canada's world market share of uranium production has virtually doubled, while that of the United States has been cut in half. Is that the type of future that is in store from a Government that states it is so concerned about environmental considerations? Is that the type of future that is in store for energy production in the energy resource sector in Canada? Are the increasing wastes left over from that process the residue of this Government's policies and its trade deal? If so, it puts the lie to all of the handwringing and the anguish shown by Members opposite over their great environmental concerns.

This trade agreement is bad for the environment. It is bad for working people. It is bad for men and women. We have been challenged throughout the election to say what is our alternative to this trade agreement.

Mr. Nowlan: And you lost.

Mr. Kristiansen: The alternative is a nation called Canada, a Canada that is fair to working people, fair to the environment, and most important, a Canada that is fair to future generations who are entitled to freedom of choice.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa): First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to greet my dear constituents of Bourassa thanks to whom I am here tonight. I wish to thank them for choosing me to protect their interests and, as I promised them, I will not wait ten years before rising and speaking for them in this House.