

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

have accomplished now and what they have yet to accomplish as a country.

In his vain efforts to cast aside the rights of Members to present and debate amendments, the Parliamentary Secretary was even unable to put forward an argument that was not contradictory and conflicting within the very words that were used. First, he complained that all the amendments offered by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) simply struck language from the Bill. He then rose to speak about an amendment which specifically wanted to add language to repair one of the very serious omissions in the Bill. I refer to a definition of "Canada" for the purpose of this Bill.

I want to say that I have just been informed by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry that Maurice Rosenberg at the Trade Negotiations Office was the person with whom the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry spoke on the matter—

Mr. Axworthy: The research bureau.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Rosenberg was not spoken to by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry but a representative of the Liberal Research Bureau as to why there was not a definition in Bill C-130 of "Canada".

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am becoming somewhat confused as to who said what to whom. I think the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry has said he talked directly to the person who gave him that message. Now we understand that it was the Liberal Party Research Office who spoke. Who spoke to whom? The Hon. Member told the Parliamentary Secretary that he spoke directly to the person.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): That is a point of debate and not a point of order. Once Hon. Members get their messages straight, I would appreciate knowing about it. The Hon. Member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): This matter can be settled very easily. Our rules provide for the summoning of a witness to the bar of the House to answer questions. I would be quite prepared to move the appropriate motion so that Mr. Rosenberg can be summoned to the bar of the House and questioned about the conversation he had on this matter.

I want to conclude by saying it is illustrative of what is wrong with the approach of the Conservative Government to this whole matter of our dealings with the United States when the Parliamentary Secretary attempts rather vainly to argue that it is more important in this Bill to define "United States" and not to define "Canada" for the purpose of the trade deal. As far as the Parliamentary Secretary is concerned the Customs Act and the definition in it is sufficient even though it is very clear from the terms of the Bill that it and the trade deal to which it refers supersedes and prevails over any legislation that may have anything to do with this trade deal.

If this matter is important to the Government, and the Parliamentary Secretary was rather weakly trying to get that across, then one could ask why as a matter of certainty the Government did not put a definition of Canada in the Act in the first place and why for the purposes of certainty it is not willing to accept the amendment now before the House offered by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry.

• (1620)

There are all sorts of definitions in the Bill, and there are all sorts of definitions in the trade deal; all sorts of things are put in there for reasons of certainty. For example, there is an exclusion from the deal of beer and logs, and a number of other things that I could come up with. If it is made clear that logs and beer are not supposed to be covered by the deal, surely it would be a very limited and minor concession by way of certainty to agree to this amendment and have in Bill C-130 a definition of Canada, in order that if this deal ever comes into effect the lack of a definition of Canada in this legislation would not give the United States the opportunity to have more *Polar Sea* incidents, to take over the resources of our sea bed, and do all sorts of things which the administrative statements—

Mr. McDermid: It gives teenagers acne, too.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): I say to my hon. friend if there is any problem with teenage acne it must be on the inside of his head.

I am sorry that the Canadian people have to see a matter of this seriousness treated in this manner by the Parliamentary Secretary. I am making serious arguments. It shows what is wrong with the whole approach of the Conservative Government that it is not willing to accept, as a matter of good faith and good will, that we who do not agree with this measure do so out of deep conviction and deep seriousness. This amendment is a serious amendment. The Government is showing what is wrong with its approach to this deal, and what is wrong with its approach to the future of this country in not being willing to accept this amendment which simply wants to put into the deal a definition of Canada.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important amendment that we are debating at the moment regarding the trade deal with the United States. To put it in some context, one could simply raise the question: "Was this left out inadvertently?" Did the Government consciously decide that it did not want to define what Canada was in the trade deal? Why should this come as a surprise?

When our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was a little boy he took a great deal of pride when the big American corporate leaders would come to Baie Comeau. He would play the piano and sing songs for quarters, and they would cheer and say what a nice boy he was. A little time passed and the Prime Minister decided to work for an American subsidiary in Canada, the Iron Ore Company of Canada. Part of the work