

consummated. He has also denied a referendum to allow Canadians to clarify their view of this agreement.

Canadians are being denied these processes by which they can express their views to their elected leaders during a most crucial time in Canadian history.

That is why we in the Liberal Party believe that a committee should travel to all regions of this large and diverse country. This deal has the potential of affecting the lives of all Canadians, whether they live in big cities or small towns, whether they are farmers, fishermen, factory workers, or business owners. The quality of life for Canadians should not be predicated on whether they happen to live in a specific city within their province. That is why it is important that if this committee is to travel, that it travel to all the communities and give a voice to all Canadians. Their input should be felt not after the election and not in some other book the Prime Minister might wish to write about where he stood. The voices of Canadians should be heard now so that they can have some measure of opportunity to change the course of this very agreement.

• (1630)

If the Prime Minister, his Government and his Cabinet are confident about this deal, as they seem to be every day during Question Period, there should be no timidity on behalf of the Government to go to the regions of this country.

Not only do we not have the fine print of the agreement tabled at this committee so that Canadians can actually see where the "t"s are crossed and the "i"s dotted, but the Government does not want the committee to travel to all the communities with the general outline of the deal. That should tell us something about what the Government really thinks and, more important, what it really fears. It fears that Canadians will have an opportunity to see the deal for what it is. It is not free trade, it is the first step of economic union, to be followed by the discussion of political union. This deal deserves the scrutiny of all Canadians so that they can say something about the future of their country and the country of their grandchildren. If the committee is to travel, let it do it properly and let it be accessible to those Canadians who want to stand up and be heard.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Belsher)—Immigration—Amnesty for refugee claimants—Government position/Statement attributed to Chairman—Designate of

### Motions

Refugee Board; the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap)—Nicaragua—United States funding of Contra attacks/request that Government urge Honduras to honour its commitments.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR STANDING COMMITTEE TO TRAVEL

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis:

That the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade be authorized to adjourn from place to place in Canada between November 22 and December 5, 1987, for the purpose of holding hearings, as the Committee deems appropriate, on the subject of the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States, and that the necessary staff do accompany the Committee.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, moments ago I was in the lobby of the House meeting with a constituent. We were talking about free trade as it affected that constituent's plant just as the debate commenced on the issue of the travel of the committee to listen to free trade issues.

It is bad enough, as my colleague, the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) so eloquently pointed out, that we do not even have the full text of the agreement, but we are proceeding with hearings in which my constituents and the constituents of every other Member are supposed to make representations to the Government on whether or not they are in favour of an agreement which they have not seen, but only have the general outline.

I have a letter in my hand that was given to me by my constituent moments ago. The industry to which I am referring is known as Texturon. It is a mill in Hawkesbury, Ontario, which employs some 70 to 75 of my constituents. I invite Hon. Members opposite to listen. They may learn something.

**Mr. Friesen:** It did not stop Premier Peterson.

**Mr. Boudria:** I must respond to the Hon. Member opposite who said it did not stop Premier Peterson from holding hearings. That is a mighty interesting view. First of all, as the Hon. Member will know, Premier Peterson personally is against the free trade agreement, very correctly so. Second, it is not Premier Peterson who has negotiated this mess, it is the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and his bunch of cronies.

**Mr. Friesen:** That is overpowering logic.

**Mr. Boudria:** They are the ones who messed it up. I will read the letter given to me by my constituent to explain why we need to hold hearings in more than a few selected communities where the Government hopes that little controversy