

Oral Questions

visiting warships honour our no nuclear weapons policy, let us have an election and get a Government that will.

* * *

TRADE**CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—CALL FOR BAN ON EXPORT OF WATER**

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, repeatedly Canadians have been told that water exports to the United States are not in the trade deal. Last November the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) said that water had never been negotiated in the free trade talks. Yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary told the House that water is not part of the trade deal.

Despite such denials, Article 22.01 of the Canadian tariff schedule specifically refers to: "waters, including natural or artificial mineral waters and aerated waters, not containing added sugar or other sweetening matter nor flavoured; ice and snow".

There is nothing in the trade deal preventing the export of water as was done with logs, unprocessed fish, and beer. The absence of a specific exclusion of water from the trade deal is dangerous. Further, it makes a mockery of the Minister of the Environment's water policy, with the promised legislation to ban water exports. We urge the Government to ban the export of water in the proposed trade legislation.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

TRADE**CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—PROVINCIAL COMPLIANCE**

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister for International Trade. In the last several months we have heard repeatedly from the United States Government and from the U.S. Congress that they would only ratify the Canada-U.S. trade agreement on the grounds that the federal Government would intrude into provincial affairs and require full compliance by the provinces.

Yesterday we saw once again how the federal Government capitulates to those demands. The trade Bill tabled yesterday provides the federal Government with a loaded gun that will completely and totally intrude into a wide range of provincial jurisdictions to force compliance with the Canada-U.S. agreement.

Is it not true that the American Government is now becoming in effect a third party to federal-provincial relations

in Canada, and that the federal Government has decided to take the power of intrusion into key areas like energy, resource pricing and service management simply in order to meet those American demands?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that that, of course, is entirely incorrect. He should also know that under the BNA Act the regulation of interprovincial trade and commerce and international trade and commerce is a jurisdiction given to the Government of Canada. Without that jurisdiction, Canada could not enter into an international agreement with any other nation in the world and enforce such an agreement. If that were the case, then Canada would be ignored by the world community because it would not have a federal Government that could agree to and enforce trade and commerce arrangements entered into.

Finally, I might remind the hon. gentleman when he talks about resource pricing that it was his Party that introduced the national energy policy, that attempted to crush the provinces and crush provincial rights to price their resources, and crush the provinces entirely.

Mr. Broadbent: So why are you doing it?

Mr. Crosbie: They were assisted by the hypocrite who leads the New Democratic Party who gave them full assistance in that object.

PROVISIONS OF BILL—FEDERAL POWERS

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would say that the great strategy of reconciliation has become the great crusher of all times. We have seen in this Bill a major takeover of provincial jurisdictions, contrary to the interpretation that has been provided by the courts over the past half century.

Clause 8 of the Bill the Minister tabled yesterday also provides for a total override of the laws of this federal Parliament. The trade agreement supersedes and overtakes laws provided by this Parliament on affirmative action, on human rights, and on freedom of information. Is the Minister for International Trade aware that he has created this major imbalance, that the trade deal will now supersede federal law, and that the sovereignty of this Parliament has been undermined? At the same time the U.S. Congress has taken a totally opposite stand. Why has the Minister countenanced this total capitulation and undermining of the rights of this Parliament?

● (1420)

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is referring to a clause which says that the provisions of the Bill implementing the free trade agreement will override any inconsistent provision of other federal legislation. That is all it says.

Some Hon. Members: That's all!