

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

price. What the Members of this House must do in these negotiations is ask themselves whether the price of this trade deal is really worth it.

Mr. Pagtakhan: Mr. Chairman, I rise with a Damocles' sword of closure over my head. Should it happen it will be the equivalent of parliamentary slavery. We have heard reflections on the part of government of arrogance in attitude, unfairness in approach and discrimination to the new Members of Parliament.

In the spirit of this holiday season first let me greet you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Her Excellency the Governor General, all our colleagues in the House and Senate, all Canadians, all families across the country and, more particularly, the constituents of Winnipeg North with the twin messages of peace and prosperity and in the language of my original tongue, *Maligayang Pasko at Manigong Bagong Taon*. Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

It is also in this festive spirit that I would like to speak to the subject of the free trade deal and the implementing legislation. Allow me, Hon. Members, to reflect also during this festive season a sadness with you.

A few months ago a member of my Filipino community, a Canadian immigrant, was hastily deported to the Philippines. Her name is Sally Espinelli. I question the fairness of this Government. It is fundamental rule of fairness that a person is given avenues for redress, including appealing a case to the Canadian Human Rights Commission. In fact, the Canadian Human Rights Commission recommended that Sally Espinelli's case be placed before that body. That was not to happen because the Government failed to exercise the virtue of moral fairness and denied a Canadian immigrant the due process of judicial review.

Now back to the subject of tonight, the free trade deal. I seek the understanding of government to allow amendments to this deal, to make clarifications and thereby prevent uncertainties in the future. Is there a basis to believe that there are uncertainties in the future?

The Minister for International Trade, if I may paraphrase, said that it would take four to five years to see whether this deal was good or bad. That, to me, is an admission that the deal could be bad, and we believe it is bad. We believe it is bad for the people of our country. Sure, statistics have also been mentioned of jobs being created. Statistics have been mentioned of jobs that will be lost. What is clear, and I think it has been denied by government, is that jobs will be lost.

To that problem we have to have a mechanism—common sense dictates—to help the displaced workers of our country as a consequence of this deal. Let me say to the Government that even Supreme Courts of nations allow reconsideration of original decisions. Why cannot the Government, during this season of understanding, allow amendments so that the total sentiments of the Canadian people across the country can be reflected truly in this deal? It is indeed a big challenge to the Government. It needs a big heart to answer the challenge.

• (2120)

I am referring to a declaration entitled "A Canada—U.S. Church Declaration on Justice for Farmers and Food for People", adopted in September, 1988. This group is committed to justice and to supporting the self-sufficiency of peoples in producing their own food and developing their own economic and social institutions to enhance the quality of life. It is a group deeply committed to security to tenure for those who work the land, a group deeply committed to wide distribution of land among people, a group deeply committed to the right of people to eat healthy and nutritious food, a group committed to a system of pricing that returns to the producer of food the cost of production plus a fair return that provides a reasonable standard of living, a group deeply committed to countering the concentration of control and ownership of land by the few and the domination of food production and distribution by corporations. I submit that these principles of morality and of commitment to people are sound and laudable.

I submit to the Government that this group is deeply opposed to this deal because it feels that the deal is detrimental to those principles.

Article 409, "Other Export Measures", asks us to guarantee supply to the United States of our total resources. It states:

1. Either Party may maintain or introduce a restriction otherwise justified under the provisions of Articles XI:2(a) and XX(g), (i) and (j) of the GATT with respect to the export of a good of the Party to the territory of the other Party, only if:

a) the restriction does not reduce the proportion of the total export shipments of the specific good—

I would like to call to the attention of the Government that this article does not only refer to energy. It continues:

—made available to the other Party relative to the total supply of that good of the Party maintaining the restriction as compared to the proportion prevailing in the most recent 36-