

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

it can, but many of the provinces are not going to go along with that. Tory Governments are more interested in dollars than they are in Canadians.

It is very revealing that the Government wants to ram this legislation through both Houses of Parliament. It will make every effort possible to do so but never wants this trade package to go to the Canadian people for a vote. What is wrong with the Government? Is it afraid of democracy? Why all the crying and worrying about the Senate not passing the Bill? If the Senate does not pass it, it will go the country and we will have an election on it.

Government Members ask how we can do that when dealing with provincial jurisdiction. That is very easy for Tory mentality. Do you know what happened after Mackenzie King won the 1926 election?

Mr. McDermid: Remind us.

Mr. Hopkins: I am not reminding the Member, I am teaching him because he obviously does not know what he is talking about. The fact is that for some strange reason it suddenly did not become provincial jurisdiction and the Tory-dominated Senate voted in favour of the old age pension Bill after 1926. It was introduced again by Mackenzie King and went through the House of Commons and the Senate. If that was a constitutional inaccuracy in 1925 why was it not so in 1926? That is so because we have Tory governments that are only interested in their interests of the moment. They do not look at the long-term interests of the country. As my friend, the Hon. Member for Algoma said, they are interested in giving the country away.

They do not want to do anything to make any disturbance in Washington. My goodness, that would be terrible, that would ruin the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) record. His friend is about to leave the American scene and he is about to leave the Canadian scene, so what is the difference? We will then be back to a state of sanity. In that situation the true democracy of this country will come forward and the Canadian people will have an opportunity to vote on issues. Let the people decide.

Mrs. Sparrow: How much voting did we do on the energy Bill?

Mr. McDermid: Remember wage and price controls.

Mr. Hopkins: I love this, Mr. Speaker. I am getting my message across. The Prime Minister was so much against this deal in 1983. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) laughed at the present Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) because the Minister for International Trade was in favour of this in 1983. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance laughed at him during the leadership race, but he was the only one who was telling the truth. The only thing is that not only Tories but every Canadian in the country is now laughing at the Minister for International Trade. He never read the agreement to start with.

Let us start protecting the Constitution of Canada and recognizing that this legislation does in fact affect provincial jurisdiction. Let the old age pension Bill prior to the 1926 election and after be a history lesson to my hon. friends opposite. They defeated the first old age pension Bill in Canada. They are now saying that they were elected to do this. They were not elected to bring in a trade deal such as this because it was not in their platform during the last election campaign. They do not have a mandate from the Canadian people to do this.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to participate at this stage of the debate. We are now debating Motion No. 5 which identifies a number of clauses in the trade deal which we believe ought to be abandoned. At the top of the list is the fact that this trade deal allows almost unrestricted foreign investment from the United States in Canada.

I want to begin by posing a couple of questions. Do Members realize that the western industrialized nation with more foreign ownership and more foreign control of its economy than virtually any other is Canada? Canada has more foreign ownership and more foreign control of its economy than any western industrialized nation with the exception of Belgium.

To what extent does that foreign ownership exist? Fifty per cent of the industrial sector of our economy is foreign controlled or foreign owned. If you take out the financial sector, Canadian banks, you find that 35 per cent of our economy is foreign owned and foreign controlled. Should that cause us any concern?

We know that the Japanese are worried about the amount of foreign ownership of their economy. Three per cent of the Japanese economy is foreign owned and that causes them concern in a number of sectors. They believe that it is bad to have too much foreign investment because there are then people outside the country making decisions about their future.

More and more decisions regarding the future of our children and our children's children are being made not in Vancouver, Toronto, Calgary, or Montreal, but in Tokyo, Dallas, Amarillo, Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Hamburg. That must cause Canadians some concern.

What about our friends in the United States on the other side of the trade equation we are debating tonight? Four per cent of the American economy is foreign owned. The United States Congress had a special debate a few weeks ago about the serious concerns in the United States because foreign ownership has reached 4 per cent. If there was 35 per cent foreign ownership of the economy of the United States there would be a major revolt in the country.

Yet the response of the Government of Canada, realizing that 50 per cent of our industrial sector is foreign owned and 35 per cent of our entire economy is foreign owned, is to ask for more foreign ownership. In fact, the Government wants to open the floodgates and tell the United States that Canada is