

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Europe. We cannot pretend that the world that exists in some textbook that the Hon. Members from Windsor have read still exists. It does not.

Those who prosper in the world are the Japanese, the Swiss, the West Germans—

Mr. McCurdy: Real free trade economy is in Japan.

Mr. Kilgour: These are the people who know that producing high-quality goods with service to customers and intelligence is the way of the future. I remind Hon. Members that the average people in those countries are doing very well. As I think Canadians will show in the next election, Canadians know that that is the route we have to take.

The Hon. Member said a moment ago that Japan is not in a trade group. That is true, but which of the other OECD countries is not in a trade group except for Japan, Canada and the United States?

Mr. McCurdy: How much foreign ownership is there in Japan?

Mr. Kilgour: If we complete this agreement, as I very much hope we will, then Canada will be part of the largest, most prosperous trading community on earth, though some could argue that the Common Market is stronger. At least we will then be able to tell the people of Windsor, Edmonton, Toronto and St. Catharines to tool up because they can now sell to the entire North American market.

I will give an example of this. Unfortunately it is not an example from Edmonton but from Montreal. A man who makes children's winter garments in Montreal has to pay a 42 per cent tariff on costumes with ornaments on them when he ships them South. He is in favour of this agreement.

Mr. Langdon: He still will.

Mr. Kilgour: He will not. It will be phased out over 10 years, as the Hon. Member knows.

Mr. Langdon: Not for clothing.

Mr. Kilgour: If we can get rid of those tariffs and the non-tariff barriers, Canadians, whether they live in Newfoundland, northern Nova Scotia, northern Ontario, northern Quebec or western Canada, will have the same sort of benefits the people of southern Ontario have had, deserve to have and, I hope, will continue to have. That is why I very much hope that this agreement will go ahead.

I personally am looking forward to fighting an election on this issue. I think the Members who are asking us to look back 30 years will find that Canadians are not backward looking people. They believe in the future. They believe we can compete in North America. Once we have started to do that, they believe that we will be able to compete better in the Pacific Rim, in Europe and in other parts of the world.

I trust that allocation of time will be applied shortly and that before very long we will all be out looking our voters in the eyes, telling them, as *The Globe and Mail* has said, that if the deal is scuttled, the grass may not grow in Windsor but there are a lot of places where the grass will grow. I remind Hon. Members from Windsor that the agreement will enshrine the Auto Pact in it, and if the Americans want to rescind the Auto Pact, which they can do now very readily and quickly, they will have to rescind the entire trade agreement.

I appeal to the people of Canada who have benefited most from free trade in automobiles to let the rest of the Canadian people enjoy some of the things they have enjoyed.

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing about this debate this evening is that very few Members opposite are speaking to the amendment. We just heard a speech that was so totally off the amendment that the Hon. Member should have been called to order.

• (1850)

We heard the Parliamentary Secretary telling the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) that he should have moved his amendment in committee and discussed it there. What is the sense in moving amendments in a parliamentary committee where the Government, in the form of Members opposite, is totally dedicated to voting down those amendments?

Mr. McDermid: Not true.

Mr. Hopkins: Members opposite are talking in circles. They are trying to mislead the Canadian public into thinking that the committee was very meaningful. It was a good discussion but they certainly did not accept amendments.

Mr. McDermid: That is wrong.

Mr. Hopkins: You can look at any other piece of legislation that has gone through this House and you will see that the amendments which have been made would compare very favourably to the way this legislation, involving the greatest issue which has faced Parliament in decades, was handled. It was handled badly by the Government of Canada and its members who sat on that committee.

Mr. McDermid: You were not there, how would you know?

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Brampton always has his say, but I am used to that when I am up here speaking because I know that things I say get him very upset.

Let us get back to the amendments and the real issue here, which is the fact that in this Bill the geographic boundaries of the U.S. are outlined clearly—

Mr. McDermid: Why?