unless it is to facilitate the way in which corporations play off workers in one country against those in another.

Ever since the advent of the production line system, ever since the advent of multinational corporations, it has sadly and regrettably been a dream of the executives and investors in multinational corporations that there would be complete substitute ability of the labour component, that it would become totally fungible so that a product could be produced in any given country for a market, no matter where, and it could be produced under the most favourable—simply, the least costly—conditions and that workers could be treated with the same interchangeability, the same casual acknowledgment, as the dollar bill that goes with so many others to make up the capital investments required.

That is surely not something Canadian Governments, particularly faced with the economic power of U.S.-based multinationals, should be subscribing to. That surely is not the model of democracy, not the model of an economy that Canadians should be subscribing to. The model of democracy that we have heretofore ascribed to, is a model in which the people, by the exercise of their vote franchise, select governments to represent their interests. It is a model in which governments have the power to control the activities of corporations.

What is being promoted by Clause 15 in its present form, and what is being promoted, regrettably, by the Government's trade deal with the United States, is a model in which decision-making and power are shifted away from democratically elected governments into the arena of the boardrooms, the stock markets and the corporate decision-making investing processes.

While none of us deny the need for power in those fields to accomplish necessary economic development in a free society and a mixed economy, what we are saying, and what we have to say at every point, is that we will not allow those powers to override the powers of Government, either by subverting them or by openly abrogating them, which this will be part of.

The raising of economic standards in the Third World is not something—and here we include Mexico—that is going to be accomplished by the simple provision, whether deliberate or by neglect, of loopholes through which Third World products can flow. It is only going to be accomplished, in terms of long-term economic development and in terms of a democratically based economic development, by deliberate policy and strategy initiatives taken by the wealthier countries.

That is the ultimate tragedy of the Maquiladora industrial program. It is not something that has come about because of American goodwill towards Mexico, because of a wish of the Americans to help, although, heaven knows, it would be in its own economic interest to help. It has not come about because of that. It has come about because of these loopholes and because those American corporations have seen the loopholes and have started moving the jobs out of Michigan and Ohio and down into the northern provinces of Mexico.

It irks me when I hear the Minister complain that the New Democratic Party wants to debate amendments like this in the context of a tariff harmonization Bill. What are we to debate if the Government will not put its free trade measure before the House of Commons for debate? We will debate whatever we are given to debate. And we will talk about free trade because the Government cannot have it both ways.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Debate.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, the Minister when he spoke a little earlier today said something about this amendment not being necessary, that when we see the details of the so-called free trade agreement with the United States we will see that this amendment was irrelevant, redundant and unnecessary. If that is true, if the Minister knows now what is in the final text, surely it is incumbent upon him to have one of his colleagues stand and read that portion of the agreement he seems to now know makes this amendment unnecessary or redundant, whatever words he used.

If the Minister knows that much about it, surely he owes it to the House of Commons to tell us. Without that, I do not believe him. One must accept the Minister's word. I will accept his word, but there is a difference in accepting it and believing it. I hope the Minister will see to it that one of his colleagues tells us forthwith what is in the agreement that makes this amendment unnecessary. I feel ashamed as a Canadian that we would take part in aiding and abetting what the United States wants to do by the back door that we would not allow it to do by the front door.

I have always believed that Canada should make a direct trade agreement with Mexico. I notice that the price of a head of cauliflower is now $3. The price went up by about $1.50 in one week in the City of Ottawa. These are vegetables brought up from Arizona and California. Let us make a deal with Mexico for vegetables. It is up to here in vegetables. Let us send Mexico what it needs from us in technological assistance, in breeding cattle, and all the things it needs from us, and get vegetables in return. However, what we are doing is allowing this 18th century or 19th century exploitation by the United States, allowing it to do through the back door what we would not let it do through the front door, under the guise of trade harmonization. It may try to have some harmony, but in that harmony the name of the tune will be the *Star Spangled Banner*.

The Americans pay in northern Mexico 65 cents an hour. That is economic tyranny. It is economic imperialism of the worst kind. For the United States to tell us that that kind of production in the northern part of Mexico, within a few miles of the Rio Grande River, is considered to be made in the United States, is the worst kind of economic chicanery. Canada should not be a party to that. It should not aid and abet that kind of imperialism.

I do not understand the drive of the Government for a free trade arrangement. It will go to any lengths to get it. It will do