

Customs Tariff

told the press, Ottawa's spokesman in Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I would ask him quite frankly to come right out and talk about the virtues of protectionism. I ask him to give us his perception of the future of the shoe industry. I invite him to give us his perception of the future of the textiles industry. The Minister knows all about the industry.

If he agrees with every single word the Parliamentary Secretary has said, this means that the Minister is prepared to let a vital sector of the economy in his riding go down the drain. I cannot believe a Minister could be so irresponsible, and that is why I assumed the Minister did not agree with his colleague for LaSalle (Mr. Lanthier) on protectionism and probably a host of other subjects as well.

Now to get back to the substance of the Bill, I believe that where certain items have been removed or tariffs have been substantially reduced, in some cases this will be very useful, and I am thinking for instance of hearing aids for the deaf and safety face-shields for workers. However, what I really hope is that instead of saying: We are going to allow greater penetration of the Canadian market by imported products, the Minister of State for Small Businesses, and others with him, will encourage the manufacture in Canada of most of the items we have here. Before opening up our markets, I wish the Government would take a look at appliances that are not manufactured in Canada,—and I hope the Minister has looked at everyone of them,—and let us know which products we are now importing duty free cannot be made here in Canada. I am thinking, for instance, of earthenware and other clay tiles and a lot of other items for which I am sure Canadian manufacturers could be found.

All this means that in the coming months we will have a chance to start a real debate on free trade.

Beyond the amendments to the Customs Tariff, we are going to talk about principles and, in that respect, I think it will be very important for all Hon. Members to realize how serious the decision of the Prime Minister might be when his only concern is to please his American big brother. I think everyone will have to realize how dangerous it is to have a Prime Minister who is used to taking his orders from the States. And you know, that's the way things worked in his professional career. Besides, we notice that since coming into office he has been following the very same pattern. Therefore, you cannot blame the Opposition for wondering how sound is this Bill and how sound are the remarks of Hon. Members opposite. That is why I believe it is our role to make sure that their rhetoric is not detrimental to our Canadian workers.

Mr. Speaker, Canadian workers will never accept to lose their jobs for the sake of the so-called friendship with the American big brother, which is what the Government here is prepared to do. Therefore I invite them to be careful and moderate in their remarks, because I think that an over-all move towards free trade might be detrimental to the future of Canadian workers and of Canada as a whole.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I know that this Bill is of minor importance in relation to this whole debate, and I am sure that in the months ahead we will have the opportunity to further discuss it at length together.

[English]

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments of my hon. friend. They were most surprising to me. He spoke as if we were debating a Bill which would do away with all the tariffs of this country. In fact, we are dealing with a Customs Bill which will put in place some modest changes to some of those tariffs. It is not a revolutionary Bill at all. It is in many respects a housekeeping Bill. In fact, I suppose the most significant feature of the Bill is to increase the dollar amount of exemptions that a visitor coming back from the United States to Canada within 48 hours can bring with him which, after this Bill is passed, will be \$100. That seems to me to be something that my friend should be applauding.

● (1740)

In addition to that he singles out the fact that tariffs are being removed on hearing aids and protective equipment for workmen as something that is frightening and that the Canadian public should shrink with fear when they hear about it. Surely my hon. friend cannot object to providing hearing aids at the lowest cost possible for those who have problems hearing and surely my hon. friend cannot object to providing protective equipment at the lowest possible cost.

The other item that he mentioned had to do with footwear. In fact there is nothing in this Bill at all that affects footwear. It does not change the situation one iota. There continues to be a tariff; there continues to be a quota.

My hon. friend seems to have missed the point of what we are talking about here and I hope that in future he will listen a little more carefully to the debate on the Bill in principle.

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on Bill C-71 and I will take this opportunity first of all to remind the previous speaker that he has misunderstood the statements of the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre). Obviously, the Hon. Member for Shefford does not take exception to some clauses of Bill C-71 but to the general principle of the Act to amend the Customs Tariff. The purpose of this Act to amend the Customs Tariff is to show once more to the Canadian people that the Conservative Government is kowtowing to important American interests. This legislation is simply unveiling another aspect of the total abdication of authority of our Prime Minister to the President of the United States.

One remembers the *Polar Sea* incident, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark (Yellowhead)) rose at the beginning of the sitting of the House and made great statements of policy, telling us that this time, he was decided to act, while the American ship crossed our borders without