

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

the Government was not going to televise the debate. It did not want the people of Canada to learn any more than they already know about this deal, because government Members know that every day as Canadians learn more and more about what this does in terms of the ultimate sell-out and give away of this country that they are rejecting it.

My constituency butts against the grapegrowing areas of British Columbia. Hundreds and hundreds of growers who have struggled for years, some have struggled for decades, to develop the vineyards and the small wineries of the Okanagan Valley have all of a sudden had the rug pulled out from under them as this Government says: "We don't care about you. We don't care about your industry. We are going to finish you in a number of months". Those are the first obvious victims of this trade deal. The vineyards are gone. The cottage wineries are gone. The small, medium-sized wineries are gone.

• (1630)

Mr. McDermid: You are totally wrong.

Mr. Riis: When the Prime Minister was in the Okanagan Valley trying to explain the trade deal he was laughed out of the Valley. People said: "You have guts to come here and tell us that this is good for us. Look at our hillsides in Vernon and Kelowna. The vineyards are withering because we cannot go to the banks to get operating loans, and you are telling us this is good for us?" The Prime Minister was the laughing stock of the entire central valleys of British Columbia. I do not think he has the courage to go back there again. With the kind of response that he got, I know I would not be going back if I were the Prime Minister trying to pull this fast one on Canadians.

What we are saying in this very serious motion is that Canada be defined as meaning 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. Is that an unreasonable request to define in Clause 1 of the agreement what Canada is all about? This particular motion before us is an appropriate motion that ought to be debated. I will be listening carefully this afternoon as Government Members explain to Canadians why they do not want to define what Canada means in this trade deal.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to speak on Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65 which are definition clauses of Canada. It might be interesting to analyse why a definition clause is not in the Bill to start with. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister suggested that the definition is in another Act. Maybe the definition is not in this Bill because the definition that we have of Canada is not acceptable to the United States. Because the Americans would not accept it Canada acquiesced and said: "We will not put in a definition. You make your own." When the panel deals with issues brought before it, it will put into the

agreement its own definition. Still it is necessary to see why this particular definition is not there. Maybe we have been missing the point.

Every area and industry will be affected by this Bill, not just areas which we have a tendency to think of as being the borders of Canada, nor those industries that we feel are the most common ones. Every area and every industry will be affected by this definition and Bill. We are not opposed to the liberalization of trade. Maybe I should not use that word because President Reagan suggested that the word liberalization is a dirty word and therefore should not be used. Maybe that is another reason that liberalization of trade is a little bit of a problem. We are not opposed to more liberal trade laws. We are opposed to the agreement where all the generosity and liberal treatment is on the Canadian side and we get nothing in return. We are against the particular Reagan-Mulroney trade deal put before the House and that we are in the process of implementing through Bill C-130.

We got very little from this agreement, but we gave away a lot. The Government is spending \$30 million to \$50 million, depending upon who you are talking to, to brainwash the people of Canada about how good a deal this is. If this deal were as good as the Government says it is, the Government would not have to sell it. It would sell itself. The Government would not have to waste \$30 million to \$50 million of the taxpayers hard-earned money, trying to buy people with their own money. The Government is having a hard time selling the deal and we could go on for a long time saying why. Let me touch on a couple of reasons.

First are the foreign investment possibilities that are established. Foreign investment is unlimited after this deal is put into place. Any American company can buy any Canadian company with no limitations, no monetary structure and no way of looking it over. Most people consider that we already have too much foreign ownership. Fifty per cent of the profits made in Canada go out of the country already. Those profits are being used to buy other companies and corporations in Canada. In other words, not only is this Government using the taxpayers money to sell a deal that is bad for Canada and bad for the Canadian taxpayers, but the Government is saying with this unlimited, unmonitored investment policy eventually every penny of profit in Canada will be used to buy further corporations in Canada until our ownership level is less than today, and it is bad enough now.

Sweden has approximately 7 per cent foreign ownership. When that foreign ownership went up to 7.75 per cent or 8 per cent, Sweden looked very hard at the possibility of using legislation to limit the amount of foreign investment. Sweden has foreign investments all over the world and depends to a great extent on its own investments in other parts of the world. But Sweden recognized, as do most countries in the western world, that if you give away the ownership of your industries, you are giving away control of your economy.