

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

going and what we are doing. Certainly that is not happening here.

People on the street are saying they would like to know more about it. Certainly the politicians have diverse views about it. They have very different concepts of what it will do to this country. Most of all, there is a lack of trust out there. I think it is a real disgrace that the American people have had an opportunity to discuss and go through this agreement in its final form but we have not. I do not think that is the kind of agreement that we want to enter into.

The amendments in front of us now would help get rid of many of the things in this agreement which make us subservient to another nation.

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this amendment because it is a very crucial one with respect to federal-provincial relations. Motion No. 8 would eliminate Clause 6 in the Bill which says:

For greater certainty, nothing in this Act, by specific mention or omission, limits in any manner the right of Parliament to enact legislation to implement any provision of the Agreement or fulfil any of the obligations of the Government of Canada under the Agreement.

What this really means is that the Conservative Government is attempting to grab all present and future federal authority necessary to carry out this agreement. That would upset, and this is the key, the traditional federal-provincial government balance deliberately developed in Canada.

I want to put a little bit of history on the record tonight because I think it is important at this time that Members opposite understand what happened prior to the 1926 election. There was a great debate at that time because the King Government brought in a Bill which would have put in place the first old age pension. The Bill passed this House under the Liberal Government and went to the Senate. It is rather interesting to learn what happened to it in the Senate in view of the great cries and screams from Conservative Members of Parliament across this country about the Senate and its interference with Bill C-130.

Do you know what happened to that Bill after passing this House of elected Members representing people across the country? The Conservative dominated Senate of the day defeated the first old age pension Bill ever introduced in Parliament. Today they are saying what a horrendous thing it is that the Senate should interfere with the trade Bill. The Senate is not interfering with it. It is not going to defeat it as the Tory dominated Senate defeated the first old age pension Bill prior to the 1926 election. The Senate will pass it on to the people of Canada and let them decide in a national election.

There is a big difference, but all we heard is this bleating and crying from the government benches about what a horrendous thing it is that the Senate is even thinking about not passing this Bill. They should remember history. It was a Tory dominated Senate at that time and they did not let it go

to the people to decide. They defeated the first old age pension Bill ever introduced and passed by this House.

Mr. McDermid: What scoundrels.

Mr. Hopkins: Let the Tory Members opposite remember that as they travel around the country bleating and crying about what may very well happen to their trade Bill.

Just imagine, isn't it terrible that the people of Canada are going to have a say in the future of their country? Isn't it terrible to think that this trade Bill should go to the people of Canada where they can decide because they have lost confidence in the Government to decide for them?

At the time that old age pension Bill was introduced the cry in the Senate was, number one, the country could not afford it. Interesting enough, they also said it interfered with provincial jurisdiction. What we are doing here in eliminating Clause 6 is eliminating the interference with provincial jurisdiction. I say to my Tory friends across the way, if it was right for your Tory friends to say that about federal-provincial jurisdiction in 1926, how come you are denying the Senate that right today? How come you are denying the provinces their jurisdiction today by passing this Bill?

Mr. McDermid: We are not.

Mr. Hopkins: You are doing it in tax measures with respect to the wine growers in various provinces.

Mr. McDermid: That is wrong, too.

Mr. Hopkins: In addition, the U.S. wants our resources. There is no question about that. The Government is willing to give away anything to get an agreement, but everyone in this House and across the country fully realizes that many of our resources are under the jurisdiction of the provinces. That does not bother the Government. It will trample over federal-provincial relations. As the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) said a few minutes ago, we well remember when we were sitting in government listening to the screaming and shouting from the opposition benches, from the very Members who are sitting over in the Government today, saying that the Government of the day was interfering with provincial jurisdiction. Well, people change their minds when they cross the floor.

• (2020)

They are not only interested in giving away our resources. They are giving away our sovereignty through this legislation. They are giving away our energy, a major resource of this country, and giving away foreign investment. There is no question that the Government is giving away foreign investment rights. In fact, it gave them away before it even introduced this legislation because it destroyed the foreign investment review legislation.

The Government is not worrying about provincial jurisdiction. It is going to try to buy off the provinces in the best way