

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

Canada. Isn't that something? The socialists love to stand up here and knock foreign investment out of one side of their mouths, and on the other side they are over there begging for it in their ridings. Invest here, create employment, create economic activity here.

I tell you, when American Motors decided to build their new plant in Brampton, I did not say, "That is terrible, take your foreign money somewhere else. Do not put it in Brampton. For heaven's sake, that is terrible". No. It created some 1500 jobs, and that will probably be 3,000 jobs eventually. That is what is important to the community and the economic growth of this country.

Then I listened to my hon. friend from Prince Albert. He talked about social programs. He said our social programs cost our manufacturers just a little more money. They increased the cost of our goods. They make them a little more expensive because we have these social services. That is out of one side of his mouth. Then, out of the other side of his mouth he says that the Americans will be saying that our social programs are an unfair trade practice and they cannot compete with Canadians. How can you have it both ways? That is the NDP's argument. That is the debate they are having.

● (2140)

Then I listened to the Liberals, the moaning, the weeping, and the gnashing of teeth going on over there. As one example, I listened to my friend, the Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), who I think is still their agricultural critic. Sometimes one must wonder, but I think he is. He talks about the wine industry, the grape growing industry of the country. For the record, I would like to refer to an article on one winery in Ontario with which I am familiar, Hillebrand. The article reads:

Hillebrand's president . . . John Swan, puts the case succinctly, "Without GATT and the FTA, the industry would have died a lingering death. This has been a useful jolt. We can produce world-class grapes here".

World-class grapes are the key to success, but it takes five years on average to produce a mature vine. Currently, Hillebrand produces two main kinds of wine: house wines, which are a blend of grapes, and varietals, which are made exclusively from one kind of grape from one grower's farm . . .

Only 30 per cent of Hillebrand's production is varietal, but the plan is to increase production as new vines mature. Varietals such as Chardonnay and Riesling command a higher price commensurate with their higher quality.

Hillebrand gets its grapes from 80 independent growers in the Niagara region who annually produce 3,300 tons of grapes on 600 acres to yield 230,000 cases of wine . . . Two years ago Hillebrand began a program of signing 10-year contracts with the producers of their best varietals in exchange for control over the way in which the growers tend their vines.

Clearly, there is a lesson here for the other grape growers of Niagara. If they switch growing high-quality European varietals and can survive the five-year maturing period for the vines, they have a great future in the brave new world of free trade.

There are signs that the growers are getting the message. In the past two months, 200,000 new vines have been planted in Niagara.

The message, very clearly, is that they can survive under free trade, that they want to survive under free trade, and that they are working toward that end rather than the doom and gloom that my friend from Algoma is always crying the blues

about and moaning and groaning about here in the House. He says that everything is so terrible in this country and we are going to hell in a hand-basket. Hemorrhoids and all the social ills are caused by free trade. This free trade is a terrible thing, my God, look out, here it comes.

Let us talk about the proposed amendments for a few moments. The first amendment that the Opposition has brought forward is to delete Article 102 of the free trade agreement which contains the objectives of the agreement. I find it amazing that the Opposition wants to eliminate the objectives of the agreement. Opposition members always talk about supporting the elimination of barriers to goods and services. The agreement facilitates conditions of fair competition within a free trade area which is what we want, fair trade.

No one will question that we want fair trade. That is what it is all about. We want liberalized conditions for investment within the free trade area. It is amazing to note that more Canadian investment went into the United States last year than American investment came into Canada. Imagine, Canadians investing offshore. Holy smokes, what is the world coming to? Well, that is happening and we want to ensure that our investors are treated as fairly as are any other investors. That is exactly what is happening.

Through Motion No. 6 our friends would eliminate Clause 4 from Bill C-130. This is a legal matter. At common law the Crown was bound by statute either if the statute so stated expressly or if, on a fair reading of the statute, the intention to have it applied to the Crown was necessarily implied. However, Section 16 of the federal Interpretation Act provides that Her Majesty is not bound by a statute unless therein mentioned or referred to. Two recent Supreme Court of Canada decisions raise serious doubts as to whether a clear implication that the statute is intended to bind the Crown is insufficient in light of the wording of Section 16. Therefore, we had to put Clause 4 into the Act to ensure that we were following the rules.

The Opposition wants to eliminate Clause 6 from the Free Trade Agreement. I get a big charge out of this because they say that the provincial Governments have nothing to do now. They say that through Clause 6 we have taken away all their powers. Can you imagine? The federal Government has taken away all the powers of the provinces.

Let us get one thing very clear. Clause 6 makes very clear that the federal Government has the right to implement an international treaty signed by two sovereign nations, and that is exactly what we are doing through this clause. The clause is an important interpretative aid but it does not, as my hon. friends would try to have you believe, change the existing division of powers in Canada. It is impossible for Parliament to give itself constitutional authority that it does not already possess. Hon. Members know that, yet they put up all these bogeymen that the provinces are having their powers taken away from them.