

Supply

decent textile industry. We believe it should and can be done. We call upon the Government to bring in a decent program which will put people and jobs first, a program which will work for all Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are no questions or comments.

Pursuant to Standing Order 13(3) it would be my duty to interrupt the House proceedings at six o'clock in order to dispose of the deferred division of Friday last on Bill C-66. However, in view of the short extension of this day's sitting due to ministerial statements, I would propose to the House to continue debate on the opposition motion until 6.04 p.m., at which time the House would proceed to the division on the said motion, followed by the deferred division on Bill C-66. Is it agreed?

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I take it we are not creating a precedent here because the symbolic four minutes which were added to today's orders could be 40 minutes or, for that matter, an hour. I just want to make sure we protect our position that statements in the House which are added to our time will not in the future be added in this same manner.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I just happened to catch the proceedings on television so I rushed in to the Chamber to say with respect to the proposal for today, it seems to be sensible. We have a procedural situation and it strikes me that your approach, Mr. Speaker, has the great advantage of logic and reason to it so I think we would accept that suggestion.

With respect to the comment made by the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) with respect to the proceedings at the end of the day, or the Adjournment Debate, so called, I will be glad to discuss the matter with the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier.

If you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the point of the provision in the rules was that we wanted to ensure that there was no diminution of private Members' rights with respect to the Adjournment Debate, particularly in those circumstances where there are ministerial statements. We bent over backwards procedurally to ensure that whenever there are statements, they would not in any way negatively impact upon the right of the private Member to ask for an elaboration on Question Period answers about which they were not satisfied. That was the genesis of the present rule. That is why we have the late night show situation in this particular set of circumstances. But we will, of course, continue to consult and I will be glad to receive the recommendations of the Hon. Member. We agree to your proposal, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the votes today and I will continue my discussions with the distinguished Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier with respect to late night shows.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The unanimous consent is only for today's business, then. Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gerry Weiner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to join in the debate today which so greatly affects all Canadians. Jobs are really what we are all after and it is ironic hearing my hon. friend, the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald), speak of how the quotas have not adversely affected Canadians. I would like to recount that in an eight-year period there was an additional cost of some \$500 million which the average consumer had to spend. So there is a dramatic effect.

I think we should also want to reflect that if our trading partners exercise their legally recognized rights of retaliation under the GATT, there will be job loss in a lot of sectors. The impact of import quotas on footwear cannot be considered in complete isolation of the impact they have on other sectors of the economy. The fact is, as the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Kelleher) said in the House, continuation of import quotas on all types of footwear would have seriously affected Canadian interest and Canadian jobs in other sectors unrelated to the footwear industry. If there are any doubts about this, ask the petrochemical producers in Ontario and Alberta, craft paper companies in British Columbia, steel producers in southern Ontario or companies producing sewing machine needles and car radios in both Quebec and Ontario. If there are any further doubts, ask the many highly successful companies producing fur garments in Montreal and elsewhere in Canada, along with the thousands of people across this country whose main source of income is tied directly to the fur industry. All of these companies have at least two things in common. First, they have been very successful in exporting their products outside of Canada, including to the European Economic Community. Second, earlier this year the European Economic Community threatened to withdraw concessions or, in more blunt terms, to retaliate against up to \$150 million worth of exports of their products. The EEC threatened to raise tariffs to prohibitive levels on Canadian petrochemical products, steel products, craft paper, fur garments, sewing machine needles and car radios.

We managed to stave off this threat of retaliation only by agreeing to forego duties on a wide range of products imported from Europe. This agreement, which was concluded only a few days before the EEC was about to implement its threat of retaliation, cost the Treasury some \$12 million. However, this was not the first compensation agreement concluded with the EEC. Two other agreements were concluded in response to earlier measures taken on footwear imports to Canada. In total, over \$13 million in duty were foregone on products from the EEC and over \$25 million globally have been paid in compensation in response to import quotas on footwear. In other words, the opposition Parties are attempting to ignore the fact that in order to benefit from exports to other countries, Canada must permit imports from those countries. The Opposition is also attempting to ignore the fact that quotas in one sector can cost jobs in other sectors. This attempt to ignore the facts will be recognized for what it is by the Canadian people.