

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

think I mentioned that was part of the debate on the imposition of the National Energy Program. That was not the case. I ought to have known. That incident took place during a constitutional problem.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) for his correction. I also want the Hon. Member to know that your Chair who was then in another position, was not one of those who stormed the Chair.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Riis:** You are absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. The Chair was not one of those who stormed the Chair.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Riis:** I have two or three points to make before we complete this matter in sharing views on the appropriateness of the Bill before us. I do not want to repeat arguments but, in spite of what a number of interveners have said, this Bill does go beyond trade practices. We will be dealing with potential social programs, the ability or inability of the Government to enact comprehensive social programs. We will be discussing energy security for future generations, the future role of Crown corporations in Canada, the matter of investment and the role and changes that will result to financial institutions. These are issues that go beyond the trade implications of the treaty signed between Canada and the United States. For that reason, to debate each of these sectors properly, a separate Bill for each would be the most appropriate course to take.

On a more practical matter, if this Bill is allowed to proceed in its present form, which is extremely comprehensive and complicated and, as the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) has indicated himself, is perhaps one of the most critical initiatives the House will debate since the Second World War, carrying horrendous implications when it comes to what the future of Canada will be, to be restricted to a 20-minute speech, as I and virtually everyone else in this House will be, makes it very difficult to reflect my constituents' views on such a wide range of issues. But that is what I am expected to do. If Hon. Members at second reading stage were simply to speak for 20 minutes, which is the maximum offered, that would come out to be 25 days of debate, let alone at committee, report stage and third reading. We need a sufficient amount of time to discuss this particular package. But to do it properly and break up the Bill would mean even more time. Canadians will understand that there is no reason to hurry a Bill of such importance, and we would we want to take perhaps a few months to examine it thoroughly.

I ask you to consider whether you feel that a Member of Parliament in 20 minutes would be able to reflect accurately the views of his or her constituents on all aspects of the Bill and then vote on the principle of it. What principle are we going to vote on, Mr. Speaker? Is it the principle of a binding settlement dispute mechanism? Members from all sides in this House have been calling for an improved dispute settlement

mechanism when we get into trade disputes with our American friends. Perhaps some people would like to vote positively on that part of the Bill but against another which opens up Canada to increased foreign investment. Yet those alternatives will not be there.

I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, to take the necessary step to enable Members of Parliament to do the job for which they were elected. The only way is to require the Government to break up the Bill into appropriate sections, so that to amend 27 different statutes will be done through a number of initiatives as opposed to one omnibus initiative.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring something to your attention which I do not think has been raised before. It has been argued that this Bill does nothing more than implement the trade deal and that is its unifying purpose. I want to say parenthetically that it was argued back in 1982 that the single unifying purpose of the energy security Bill was to implement the National Energy Program, even though a number of Bills had to be amended and other legislative enactments had to take place. This argument was not acceptable to the Conservative Party at that time. Having heard the arguments of the spokespeople for the Government in that regard I began leafing through the Bill. For example, there are explanatory notes on facing pages to each page of the Bill. If one looks at page 88 of the Bill and its facing page one will find the word "New" after reference to the clauses. In some other cases, at page 81a of the Bill the explanatory note with respect to Clause 103 reads:

This amendment would implement, in part, Article 405 of the Agreement.

Let me return to what I was saying a few moments ago. If one looks at page 88a, the explanatory note with respect to Clause 118 is simply the word "New". If one looks at the explanatory notes for Clauses 119 and 120, one finds simply the word "New".

● (1650)

It seems to me that this could well mean that the Bill goes beyond simply amending an existing statute to conform with the requirements of the trade deal between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States. One sees in the explanatory notes in some cases words that suggest that the amendments would implement one article or another of the agreement. In other cases, one finds, by way of explanatory note, simply the word "New". I think this may well have some significance in responding to the words of the Government earlier today that Bill C-130 is totally different from the energy security Bill of 1982.

In any event, we are being asked to deal with changes to the established policy as set out in statutes adopted by this Parliament in a vast range of areas that go very far beyond trade, as that term is ordinarily used, and very far beyond the amendment of tariffs touching on trade between Canada and the United States. We are dealing with almost the whole range of matters that the Government of Canada deals with as