

given to sending it to the standing committee instead of, as proposed, to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-90 covers a number of things. I want to deal with the various items one by one. Prior to the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussi eres) speaking on the bill, he said that he would table the New Zealand agreement. I think all members should take a look at that tabled document. Nowhere in the document does it call for Canada to reduce any tariffs, nor does it call for New Zealand to reduce any tariffs. It is a sweetheart deal. It has very lovely language. There is a desire to strengthen friendly relations for the promotion, encouragement and expansion of bilateral trade. It recognizes the desirability, it is mindful of the importance, and it is determined. It goes on and on. Nowhere does it say that the government of New Zealand will reduce tariffs in New Zealand, nor does it say that the Government of Canada will reduce any tariffs. It talks about the consultative process, the sharing of technological information and that type of thing. But that is not what this bill deals with. Part of this bill deals with certain tariff changes that extend to New Zealand.

Looking at those tariff changes and the whole purpose and scope of this type of bill, I want to say to the House that in my view we in Canada are losing all sorts of potential trade because we do not pay real attention to two countries in the world that should be our most complete trading partners. I am referring to Australia and New Zealand.

It is probably nice and balmy in New Zealand today. I am sure people are on the beach, because it is holiday season. It is mid-summer. The same applies to Australia. While we wade around in two or three feet of snow and suffer in very cold temperatures, Australia and New Zealand are enjoying summer. While they do not get winter like we get winter, except perhaps in Tasmania and to some extent the south island of New Zealand, their seasons are the exact opposite to ours.

● (1750)

Second, Mr. Speaker, the combined population of Australia and New Zealand is about 17 million people. They live not very much differently from us. Their hopes, their aspirations for their children, their housing, the way they speak, think and work are not much different from us. They represent for Canada a perfect market for our goods and expertise, and we represent the same thing to them.

Now, Sir, I have had some experience in the manufacturing business. One of the companies I am associated with maintains an Australian subsidiary where we sell a great deal of our products. Indeed, in one product line we have some 40 per cent of the Australian market. We would have a larger share of the New Zealand market if there had been negotiations in this trade deal with New Zealand to remove some of the import restrictions that exist there. It is a good market for us largely because what we manufacture for our spring season are the same type of goods sold for Christmas in New Zealand and Australia. So in our trade with that part of the world we are

Customs Tariff

able to get nearly two months more production using the same machinery and production lines that we use for our Canadian trade. That makes our plants very much more efficient and it means we can sell in Canada for less. Of course, the same thing applies to the manufacturers and processors in those two countries.

Any country the size of Canada, New Zealand or Australia needs a large home market so as to develop a good, profitable production run. If we were able to combine the Canadian market of 24 million people with the 17 million of Australia and New Zealand, we could eliminate this "small home market" attitude which exists in all three countries. Yet we do not seem to be prepared to get down to brass tacks with those countries. We continue to have little trade agreements, tariffs, and we do not make general agreements for an open and free trade arrangement in that market.

I say to you, Sir, that market is valuable to us. A bathing suit manufacturer in Australia or Canada—and they make good bathing suits in Australia; I have one—has an open market in the other country in his off-season. This applies equally to lawn furniture, barbecues, a whole host of things we produce here and they produce there. If we were as a nation looking at the possibility of expanding our world trade, we would enter into a common market agreement with Australia and New Zealand. We have everything going for us and could do it if we wanted to, instead of niggling back and forth with a system which contains an unbelievable number of different tariffs.

We have, Mr. Speaker, the British preference, most favoured nation, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, and the general preferred tariff. Then of course we have the "free" situation and the U.K. and Ireland situation and now, presumably, as we negotiate these bilateral agreements while still maintaining the tariff structure, we have the New Zealand tariff structure, which will presumably form another chapter in the general tariff book, a bible of unbelievable complexity.

We are not looking to our responsibilities in this field correctly, and I want to bring to the attention of the House a situation concerning New Zealand. Our trade with them is not a big deal. In 1979 we exported to them some \$90 million worth of goods and imported \$135 million worth of goods. The reason our imports in 1979 were so high is that a great deal of New Zealand meat was coming into Canada for trans-shipment to the United States. When I first saw that I wondered why, and so I inquired of L.N. Reynolds Co., Ltd., perhaps Canada's largest meat brokers, and that is what they told me.

However, in looking at our total trade with New Zealand, we find that our exports to them represent only 2.3 per cent of their imports. There is no reason why we should have such a small amount, no reason at all. Now it is quite true that their closest trading partner is Australia, but our own analysis indicates we could have a far larger trade with New Zealand if we did something about it. I want to read from page 19 of the departmental analysis. Speaking of the new energy and mineral resources in that country, it says: