

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

open season, that Americans can come into Canada and buy anything they want. As a matter of fact, the Government will only ask questions when the deal is worth more than \$150 million.

Investment Canada is supposed to be keeping an eye on foreign investment coming into Canada. Yet, the Government has not turned down a single request for investment. People say that a country needs foreign investment. However, what has foreign investment done in the four years that this Government has been in power? Has it developed new plants, new factories, new mines, or new mills? No, 95 per cent of all the foreign investment that has come into Canada in the last four years has been to take over existing Canadian companies. Over 3,000 companies that were Canadian companies before the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) came into office are now owned and operated by foreigners.

● (2030)

That must be of concern to us. Yet the Conservatives want even more foreign ownership of our economy and more foreign ownership of Canadian companies. Ninety-five per cent of the takeovers were not for new plant or new jobs. Let us talk about new jobs.

Mr. McDermid: Tell us about Oshawa.

Mr. Riis: A recent study by Statistics Canada asked how many jobs are created from a billion dollars in profits by Canadian companies versus American companies. The results are absolutely staggering. After a billion dollars in profits from Canadian corporations, the number of jobs created on average are 5,700. How about American companies? With a billion dollars in profits generated by American companies, 17 jobs are created. That is 17 jobs versus 5,700, and we wonder why there are still problems with unemployment in our country.

The Government wants more foreign control and foreign ownership. It wants more and more of the decisions about our future in Canada to be made in Dallas, Texas. I say that is wrong for the best interests of our country.

It has also been stated that this agreement will be good for consumers. According to the *Canadian Consumer* magazine, the price of a Plymouth Caravel four-door basic car in Canada is \$13,740. In the United States, that same car is priced at \$10,659. If the exchange rate of \$1.20 is added, it adds \$2,132 to the price. When one adds the 12 per cent federal sales tax, it comes to \$1,535. The U.S. car now costs \$14,326 in Canadian funds. That same car, north of the border compared to south of the border, is actually more expensive when one factors in the exchange rate and 12 per cent federal tax. Yet I have heard cabinet Ministers state that consumers will benefit from this deal. There is the evidence, and anyone can stand up to refute it, if they want, but it is plain that in terms of benefits coming to consumers, the Government is again in error.

This is a good motion because we must provide some limitation to the amount of foreign control of our economy.

Our country, with the exception of Belgium, has more foreign control and ownership of its economy than any other in the industrialized world. We should be doing something about that.

We should be doing something to build in more Canadian ownership so that Canadians make the decisions about our country's future, not foreigners. But the Government's answer to the amount of foreign ownership is to open the floodgates and tell American investors that they can come into Canada to buy any Canadian business they want with no questions asked, no expectations, no requirements, nothing. That is not what we want in Canada's future. That is not what we want in this trade deal. That is why we have offered Motion No. 5 as a way to deal with the situation.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with debate on Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8, which will be all the object of separate votes.

Motion No. 5 seeks to delete Clause 3, which states the purpose of the Bill. That is particularly interesting because it misstates the purpose of the Bill completely. I will deal with clause 3(a)(b)(c)(d) and (e) separately, but 3(d) and 3(e) are especially inaccurate and misleading. The agreement would not establish effective bilateral dispute resolution and administrative procedures and does not lay the foundation for further bilateral and multilateral co-operation. Instead, it will perpetuate the creation of regional trading blocs around the world, which will only reduce over-all world trade.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take each of these arguments in turn. Starting with clause 3 of the Bill, I read:

The purpose of this Act is to implement the Agreement, the objectives of which are to

(a) eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States;

Mr. Speaker, we know that we gave a lot to get very little. The dual objective that the Mulroney Government set of facilitating Canadian access to the American market in future will be reached, if at all, at the cost of Canada's sovereignty over its own institutions. I have in front of me a quote from former Finance and External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp, who said, and I quote, "By signing this bilateral agreement, we would be telling the whole world that we no longer intend to resist this continental attraction and we would thereby bring about the Americanization of Canada."

Mr. Speaker, paragraph (a) says

eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services . . .

Mr. Speaker, for both goods and services, I tell you that it is misleading to claim that the purpose of the Bill is to eliminate barriers, because nothing in it guarantees that they will be eliminated. As for services, I did a little research and this may be one of the biggest concessions that could have been made, the long-term consequences of which may have been the most overlooked in this debate. No studies were ever done on this