

community that says yes forever and a day. You have long-term contracts that mean that that money is going to be returned.

The same thing applies in the Province of Quebec where our critic on finance is from, the hon. gentleman in front of me. We have a \$30 billion proposal by that Government for hydro development. That money is dependent upon the same expectation and facts in the international financial community. So if the price of a barrel of oil were increased maybe to \$50 a barrel as the Conservatives would like to see it, no doubt about that—I do not know a Conservative Member who would not like to see \$50 a barrel—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I must say that questions and comments are now terminated. Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

### BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1986-87

#### MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed, from Monday, March 17, consideration of the motion of Mrs. McDougall, that Bill C-99, an Act to provide borrowing authority, be now read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the amendment of Mr. Deans (p. 11570).

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex-Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part once more in the debate on the Government's borrowing authority Bill and on our proposed amendment to give this Bill a six months' hoist, something that is totally justified by the completely inept economic performance of this Government as it faces the challenges of 1986.

Perhaps the ineptitude, the lack of knowledge, the basic ignorance with which this Government approaches economic policy has been nowhere better demonstrated than in the area of its free trade negotiations, which it seeks to carry forward with the United States. In particular, I was transfixed by a speech made last night in Sherbrooke by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret) who demonstrated his general lack of knowledge, both of the free trade argument and of the constituency from which I come.

This Minister, who is supposed to be one of the primary economic spokesmen of the Conservative Party announced, first, that we can all feel faith in free trade because the auto pact had proved itself to be such a great success, not recognizing that the auto pact is the very opposite of free trade. Within the auto pact there is, first, a commitment by the companies that benefit from the auto pact that they will sell as many cars in Canada as they produce in Canada; and, second, and more important for the jobs of Canadians, a promise that 60 per

### *Borrowing Authority Act*

cent of the value added of each vehicle made in Canada will come from Canadian value added. It is, in short, a trade pact with safeguards, exactly the sort of thing that we in this Party, and the trade union movement in this country and the thousands and even millions of people across the country who oppose bilateral free trade, are looking to achieve. They are safeguards in sectoral trade which will give Canadian workers guarantees of jobs for the future.

Unfortunately, the Minister did not seem to know that. That level of ignorance was accentuated in his net statement as reported by the *Journal de Montréal* from Sherbrooke. The President of the Treasury Board indicated as well that the strength of the auto pact was also shown by the fact that: "Windsor in Ontario, where the auto pact has succeeded so well, was a city where one found the lowest rates of unemployment in the country".

• (1610)

Unfortunately, the President of the Treasury Board had not bothered to consult his own Government's statistics. If he had, he would have found, according to the most recent month, that 9.5 per cent of the workers of Windsor are out of work. He could have compared that the Halifax where 8.7 per cent are out of work; to Quebec City where 9.2 per cent are out of work; to Ottawa where 8.8 per cent are out of work; to Toronto where 5.5 per cent are out of work; to St. Catharines-Niagara where 7.7 per cent are out of work; or indeed to Kitchener-Waterloo—where I spoke on free trade last week—where 6.8 per cent of the workforce are out of work.

In fact, no fewer than nine Canadian cities across the country have lower unemployment rates than Windsor. The Government has again demonstrated its complete lack of sensitivity and knowledge as far as my City of Windsor is concerned. It is no wonder that the Conservatives never manage to win constituencies in Windsor. If they succeeded in getting one fact about my city correct, they might be taken seriously by some of the people of Windsor. However, so long as they perpetuate ignorance and an incapacity to understand reality they will continue to be the laughing stock of my community.

The communities of my constituency have recognized both the severe dangers of the free trade thrust of the Government and the complete lack of knowledge of the Government with respect to my community. Let me quote from two documents. The first is a resolution from the town council of Amherstburg, the second largest community in my constituency, which was passed on February 14. That is the day that groups representing over 8 million Canadians met in Ottawa to protest the Government's approach to free trade with the United States. On February 14, the Town of Amherstburg passed a resolution against free trade.

The resolution states that all members of the community would be affected by a free trade agreement. Second, the infiltration of foreign products into our market-place would