

Government Orders

figure that out. Canadian wages are higher than Mexico. On average, secondary and tertiary manufacturing jobs require about \$12 to \$14 an hour here in Canada. The same job in Mexico pays 80 cents an hour. Where do you think people are going to buy? They are going to buy from Mexico. What does this study do? It says exactly that. Any dumb-bell can figure that out.

I do not know, the government is full of any kind of things, but any dumb-bell can figure that out. But it is still going to have to sign this deal. We are going to lose on secondary and tertiary manufacturing thousands of jobs because of the Maquiladora program in Mexico and because the Mexicans are paid 80 cents an hour in many instances in the Maquiladora. Talk about human rights, talk about health and safety standards, the committee of this House has not even visited the Maquiladora, has not even gone to Mexico to see what kind of competition we will be faced with and has not even questioned the violation of human rights against men and women in Mexico who the government, through its Prime Minister, says is a paramount interest, human rights all over the world except when it comes obviously to trading partners such as Mexico.

The most exploited group of the workers in Mexico are women between the ages 18 and 30. They have been removed essentially from the rural communities in Mexico, moved into the Maquiladora zone and are at mercy in the prey of unscrupulous employers documented through human rights violations and such organizations as Amnesty International and other religious community groups. What has this government done? Thumb its nose at it, make sanctimonious speeches about "Oh, we want to tie aid into human rights". What a pile of—well I will not say the word BS. I was thinking of saying BS but I will not say it.

There you go, Mr. Speaker, it is hypocrisy. I was thinking of that word but I know that is unparliamentary too. So there you go, a government that really does not give a fig about Canadian working people, and does not care about the Mexicans at the other end. The exploitation is there and even in the face of this evidence is still going ahead to sign that deal. Why?

I have come to a conclusion and I want to make an accusation. I think this government is tied into a U.S. corporate agenda and it is more interested in that corporate agenda for those international corporations than it is for the Canadian people, Canadian workers, men and women right across this country. I hate to be right on this one but I am right.

An hon. member: That will be a first.

Mr. Barrett: Well, if it is a first, it is a horrible example to start with. It is a hell of a mess and I cannot say that either, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Well, don't say it.

Mr. Barrett: I will not say it.

This government has completely sold out in terms of any commitment to ordinary Canadians, to small business in this country, to working men and working women and sits there smugly saying: "We are not going to do anything to get us out of this mess because we did everything we could to get us into it".

• (1230)

That is its philosophy. Every single one of its policies brought us to this situation. The goods and services tax was part of it. The North American free trade negotiations with Mexico are stalling corporate investments, both internally and externally, in this country. How are we going to recruit foreign capital when we have to say that our wage structure is higher here but we are willing to join to have access to our market with a low wage partner in Mexico?

Do you think a German, Japanese or any international entrepreneur will invest in Canada when we are prepared to give away our markets to both Mexico and the United States? They are not stupid. However, this government, along with the GST, along with inadequate protection of our own Canadian markets, our own manufacturing base, entered into those two trade deals.

Now the government bleats about the debt. I have heard the government cry about the debt. I see the Liberals and the Tories complain to each other about who increased the debt most first. What an absurd argument. Who increased the debt most first? They are both lousy managers. They have both squandered away