

We can expect increased productivity in the future from free trade, which will help us capture a larger share of the European, Japanese and other markets in the world. In 20 years we can expect that about 65 per cent of our exports will go to the United States, with 35 per cent going to other places in the world. We will be less dependent and less threatened by our relationship with one country. Therefore, free trade will result in lower prices, more jobs, better paying jobs and less dependency on the United States.

We have witnessed the filibustering tactics of the Opposition for over two years. In September, 1984, there was a massive change in government. We achieved the largest majority in Canadian parliamentary history, not because we were so wonderful, but because people understood that those who had been governing this country were not getting the job done. The Liberal Party really learned that because its members were almost wiped out.

The only reason the Liberals are filibustering today is that they do not want us to complete the job we were elected to do in 1984, which is to straighten out this country, get control of inflation and put 1.5 million Canadians who did not have jobs in September, 1984, back to work. We have made progress, but our target is for 2 million, 2.5 million and then three million more Canadians with jobs. The free trade agreement is a big piece of that agenda.

Canadians voted for change. Both opposition Parties stand consistently in the House seeking to go back where we were before, when Canadians were out of jobs, our standard of living was dropping like a rock, and prices were rising like balloons. Interest rates were 22 per cent and 23 per cent. Those were the results of the policies of those two Parties. We must not forget it.

This agreement is good for Canada and every Member in the Opposition knows and understands that. Yet they waste the time of this Chamber, at about \$500,000 a day. Every dilatory tactic by the Opposition costs Canadian taxpayers another \$500,000 in wasted money.

Yesterday the Opposition asked for Parliament to continue for another 350 days of debate on this issue. Such a debate alone would cost Canadian taxpayers \$175 million in order to listen to the kind of speeches we have been hearing. Do Canadians want to spend \$175 million of their money on this debate?

They do not want an election when we have kept our commitments. The Opposition wants to stop us from keeping our commitments in the hope that Canadians can be persuaded to go back to the old ways of unemployment, high inflation and so on. In addition, the Opposition has been somewhat sneaky about this. They stand up to say that they have not had much time to debate the free trade agreement.

Time Allocation

Let us examine this situation and compare June, 1987, with June, 1988, when we were trying to begin the free trade debate. In June, 1987, we dealt with 23 Bills and three other major issues in this Chamber. In June, 1988, we were only able to deal with 14, 11 of which were dealt with in three days. In June, 1987, there were no dilatory motions and phoney votes on the introduction of Private Members' Bills. This June, there were 19, which, at an average of an hour each, represented six of the 21 sitting days in this Chamber. It cost Canadian taxpayers \$3 million to watch us vote and hear the bells ring in the month of June. That took us into extended hours, with overtime for the House of Commons staff and so on.

Our first Ways and Means motion related to this legislation was first brought into the House on May 18. The opposition Members argued on procedural grounds right through to June 8, before we could even bring it into the House. That took three weeks of House time when they could have been debating if they sincerely wanted to debate the free trade issue.

We have made an assessment of this. There were eight opposition days on free trade before we got anywhere near this stage. There were two government motions and four days of debate in March and December, 1987, representing 12 days of debate on this issue in this Chamber in 1987.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade spent 120 hours in hearings. In normal parliamentary days, that is equivalent to 40 days in substantive time.

At the committee stage on this Bill, there were 87 hours of hearings, 59 witnesses and 350 submissions. That is the equivalent of 29 days of parliamentary time. There were 12 days of debate in equivalent time on the second reading stage in this House. There will be the equivalent of seven days in terms of report and third reading stages.

I have added these numbers, which come to a total of 341 hours which Members have spent on this issue. In terms of normal parliamentary days, it represents 114 days at an average of three hours of substantive time per day. This Chamber will have spent 114 days on this issue, which is enough.

Canadians elected this Government to govern. They wanted better health care, they wanted inflation under control, they wanted better pensions, they wanted more fairness in the system. They wanted the economy strengthened and they wanted jobs to be created. We have done that for them as rapidly as we could over the last four years while straightening out the mess we inherited. This is another piece in that process and I am proud to look forward to 10 minutes from now when I can vote for time allocation so that this Bill can get out of the Chamber and into the Senate. Hopefully those unelected people in the other place will see the wisdom of bowing to the will of the democratically elected Members of this Parliament.