

That is exactly what is being done in this case. This is only one of the objectionable clauses to the people of Canada which is being used to make this deal more palatable to Canadians.

I have another example. We are giving away in this Bill—

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point has to do with relevancy. The Hon. Member is delivering a prepared speech, I believe, from the NDP fact sheets. He is not referring in any way, shape or form to Motions Nos. 1, 61 or 65. I wish he would get to addressing the motions.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point or order. This is astounding. Here we have a Member rising in his place who just took the floor a few moments ago and took about seven minutes to put a diatribe to the House which had nothing to do with Motions Nos. 1, 61 or 65, and who then has the gall to call another Member to order on relevancy. This is a fraud.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I know the Hon. Member will be getting on in the debate and explaining Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert has the floor.

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, if you are defining the boundaries of Canada, you are defining the areas which this free trade deal affects. The elements in the free trade—and I do not have any notes here except the ones I wrote a few moments ago—

Mr. Gauthier: And what is wrong with notes?

● (1640)

Mr. Hovdebo: If this trade deal is made for Canada, it is made for every part of Canada. Therefore, we should define what Canada means.

I suggest there is a second area in which we are selling out Canada. We are giving away our natural advantage of resources, the natural advantage that has made it possible for us to develop industries all across Canada. Those resources have been used to help our economy, to pay for social services and to make Canada the country it is. Now, through this Bill, we will be selling those natural resources to the United States at the same price at which they will be sold to Canadian industries. Under this Bill, we cannot sell resources at a price higher than that at which we sell them to our own industries.

We can stop doing that. We do not have to sell our resources to the States, but if the U.S. uses 50 per cent of our gas now and we get short of gas in a couple of years, we will still have to give the Americans 50 per cent of our short supply. We cannot sell that gas to our industries at a price which would give them an advantage over the United States industries.

Those are the kinds of decisions in this Bill that affect all Canadians. There has been a great neglect in the whole approach to this Bill. At every stage, we have given the United States the little advantage for which it asked and without

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

which it would not sign the agreement. Whenever United States politicians talk about this Bill, they say: "We really gave it to Canada that time". The Americans are getting all the best advantages—

Mr. McDermid: What about the wheat farmers?

Mr. Hovdebo: The Wheat Board is something I want to talk about but I will not talk about it at this time. The Wheat Board will be in trouble. It is already in trouble because of the free trade Bill and it will be in further trouble. We need to look at all of these things in the context of the boundaries of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on motions numbered 1, 61 and 65, moved by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). The purpose of these motions is to amend Bill C-130 at Clauses 2, 60 and 76 by adding the following:

"Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources;"

Mr. Speaker, I think it stands to reason we should define our terms and the purpose of this agreement.

Bill C-130 includes a definition of the United States under the section "Interpretation" on page 2, which reads as follows:

Interpretation

"United States" means

- (a) the customs territory of the United States, including the fifty states of the United States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico,
- (b) the foreign trade zones located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and
- (c) any areas beyond the territorial sea of the United States within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, the United States may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and the natural resources thereof.

Mr. Speaker, why does the Government refuse to define Canada, when it provides a clear and specific definition of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, Canada's experience with the United States has not been all sweetness and light with respect to our Canadian territory in the North. I am reminded of the *Polar Sea* incident. Did the Americans agree that the Arctic—our Canadian water, let's face it,—where this big ship wanted to go for a cruise, was within our territorial waters? No, they did not. It took a lot of pushing and persuading on the part of the Official Opposition to make the Government take a clear and definite position. And today we are not sure whether this response was sufficient. Since the Government is going to build