

Supply

The second reason is: What if they have to sell something? What if they have to sell one of their small companies? Would that not be a shame. The third reason, and the most cynical of all, is: What if they have a disabled child? They must have a future. We must protect them for the future because if they are disabled then they may not be able to provide for themselves.

I say that is cynical because if they are setting \$70 million aside, as one example, surely they could do a little bit of planning with their finances to ensure that the child does okay when he or she becomes an adult. I think the government threw that disabled child example out there to make us feel bad. It is difficult to even mention this here in the House, but nevertheless that is how cynical one gets when presented with this kind of information. It is not acceptable, not in any way.

We have no idea, because of the lack of information available on these family trusts, how many are out there and how much money is involved in them, but we do know that the scandalous tax system continues. If the government has its way it will continue for another 20, 30 or 40 years. That is how cynical one can become.

Yet the government will talk about a UI cheat. He might be bilking the system for a couple of thousand dollars, but here is somebody with literally millions and multimillions of dollars and the government is saying: "That is okay, 21 years was not enough. We will give you a little more time to get your house in order".

It has been a bit of a shotgun approach but I wanted to touch on a few policies that irked me about the government. I do not think it is appropriate that we always condemn one another, but certainly I think the policies are misguided.

• (1705)

Mr. Pat Sobeski (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a very specific question about the NAFTA and one of the reasons that the NAFTA is so important.

Canadian exports of auto parts to Mexico total about \$100 million each year. Currently to get into Mexico they must incur a 10 per cent tariff, so a \$100 part plus a 10

per cent tariff is sold in Mexico for \$110. Parts producers in the United States also face the same 10 per cent tariff.

If the Government of Canada followed the member's policy and tore up the North American free trade agreement but the United States and Mexico, who originally wanted the agreement, did work out an agreement then after the phase-out period the Canadian auto part producer would be selling his part in Mexico for \$110 but the American auto part producer could sell his part down there for \$100. Who does the member think the Mexicans are going to buy from? Where does he think investment will go? It will go to the United States. What will happen to the auto parts industry in Canada because the NDP does not want Canadian auto part producers to be on the same level playing field as American part producers? I want to tell the member that when the committee was holding hearings labour unions and everyone else had difficulty in answering that question.

Can the member tell me how by tearing up the NAFTA, by excluding Canada, that will protect those people in his riding, my riding, and Windsor who depend on exports of the auto parts industry.

Mr. Butland: Mr. Speaker, the member has lost the big picture. The problem is that he has isolated something that is a little more complex than he lets on.

What he has not pointed out is that presently General Motors has more employees in Mexico than it does in Canada. This whole concept is the global trading block that will extend beyond Mexico to Argentina and El Salvador. I have seen ads that say: "Come on down to El Salvador and have Rosie sew your garments for you. She makes 33 cents an hour, and not only that but she has a nice personality too. We also have good roads down here". The ads extol the virtues of El Salvador.

He is missing the picture. The only thing these multinationals have an interest in is relocating. They will relocate in the United States in the right-to-work states or further south in Mexico, and the big three have made no bones about it. They can hardly wait until they relocate. They have said that the only people stopping them from relocating are those bloody unions that cause too much controversy and bad press.