

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

the start of the session for the improvement of the quality of life in Canada which would include every single proposed piece of legislation for the session . . . There must be a point where we go beyond what is acceptable from a strictly parliamentary standpoint.

There are three points which suggest that this Bill has gone very much beyond that stage. The point has been made by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), and I do not want to spend much time repeating it, but simply to make the point that a tremendous number of different pieces of legislation is being considered here. It is extremely difficult, in one legislative committee, to be able to cover that vast range of considerations; everything from the Meat Inspection Act to the Textile and Clothing Board Act which may or may not be in effect at the time we actually debate the Bill which adds to its complications. At this stage Bill C-110 is attempting to do away with the Textile and Clothing Board. There are those types of considerations which might at least be considered to be economic considerations. At the same time, there are also points which consider the Copyright Act and the Broadcasting Act, which certainly are much more within the realm of the people who have dealt with cultural matters within our Party.

I would not want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be possible for one person to handle these different vast areas which are being suggested for amendment from our Party on a legislative committee. The point made by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry is absolutely correct. It would be much more straightforward, more sensible, and more a reflection of the attempts to build an expertise in the House for us to see this split into segments and referred to standing committees which would be able to deal with those particular areas of concern.

That is what the United States has done with respect to its consideration of this agreement. By March it had nine committees which were actively hearing witnesses with respect to the vast set of different subject areas being considered in this legislation. Following that exercise at permitting those experts to testify, then permitting the experts on those committees who had some legislative experience in the area to make recommendations on that basis, it was possible to move to a smaller number of committees for final consideration.

There are two further points I would like to make. First, this Bill comes to us under a Ways and Means Motion.

As I look at the Bill, I have no question that there are parts of it that certainly relate to what one would expect in a Ways and Means Motion. However, there are vast sections of this Bill which one would not, under any circumstances, it seems to me, deal with in the context of a Ways and Means Motion, for example, sections of the Bill which deal with regulations and with different types of tribunals to be established and sections which deal with special import measure changes not related to the raising of finance and so forth.

It is crucial, if the House is to be able to consider those sections with full freedom, as opposed to some of the constraints under which it is necessary to operate in the context of a Ways and Means Motion, that the Bill be split for that reason.

Finally, I would like to refer to Part I, Clause 7 which states: "The agreement is hereby approved." That agreement has within it 22 chapters, a vast number of annexes, a set of definitions of different terms which exist, all of which will have an immense effect on the future of this country. As I interpret that single phrase, it will put us, as a House of Commons, in a position where it is impossible actually to make amendments to some of those sections.

For instance, let us look at the chapter which deals with services. There is an annex to that chapter of services which indicates that dozens of different segments of our economy which are considered to be covered services for the purposes of this Bill, yet an equally vast range of other services is not covered. Surely it is possible for the House of Commons to make suggestions in terms of amendments which in themselves would have the effect of changing one set of services from covered to non-covered services, and another set from non-covered to covered.

● (1520)

Yet within the Bill itself there is absolutely no reference to that, so any amendment to be made by the House would somehow, in the most difficult and bizarre mechanism possible, would have to attempt to amend Section 7 in such a way as to deal with one of these small points. The same thing could be said concerning small points in all sorts of other chapters within the trade deal itself. It might be, Mr. Speaker, that you feel this accord is not something which is susceptible to amendment, but in the United States there has been amendment after amendment put into the legislation which was transferred from the trade agreement itself. This is an executive agreement between two countries and explicitly requires the approval of both the Congress and the House of Commons. A whole set of amendments has been put into effect which will affect the legislation the U.S. Congress will face when it deals with this Bill.

Given that situation, it seems to me crucial that Bill C-130 not just be split into a series of parts that reflect the different segments in the Bill, but also that there be a reflection in the Bills that ultimately come before this House of the actual trade agreement itself. Otherwise, this House will not in a vast range of areas be able to move amendments, suggest changes, debate subamendments, and generally give this tremendously important piece of legislation its due attention. This I think could badly damage the freedom of the country in the future, because we will not be able to give the Bill its due attention without following that procedure.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me for a few minutes. I have been in