

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Mr. McDermid: I must tell you that the amendments that are proposed in this grouping are totally unnecessary. If I had more time, I could quote chapter and verse as to why they are unnecessary. For example, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) announced the make-up of the International Trade Advisory Committee, representatives of labour, industry, small business, large business. As a matter of fact, the Minister emphasized that he invited the Canadian Labour Congress to discuss the CLC's participation in the International Trade Advisory Committee. The CLC's views and the multilateral trade negotiations will be important, and I hope that they will accept my invitation. They did not accept my invitation the first time when they were invited. Let us hope that they do this time.

We involve people in the consultative process that we have instituted over the last four years, and we will continue to do so. These amendments are unnecessary.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise again and to point out to some extent to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister that in his description of the grape growers' problems and their suggestion to both the provincial Government and the grape growers of the involvement of the federal Government and the need of assistance from the federal Government, it is relative to the decision made by this Government that 50 per cent of the differential must be made up at once, or at the beginning of the trade agreement. That in itself puts the federal Government in the driver's seat and makes it responsible for the dilemma the grape growers are faced with in this next year.

● (1630)

Mr. McDermid: No, that is nonsense. Read the GATT panel.

Mr. Hovdebo: These six clauses we are dealing with cover a great deal. The first one suggests that we just not agree with this Act in any way and delete Clause 8. One of the problems in this whole discussion is the fact that government Members are making a great deal out of what they call the truth in interpretation of this agreement. In doing so, they show how arrogant they are. The interpretation of this Bill is exactly what is being disagreed with. We have a different interpretation of many of the terms of the agreement and clauses of the Bill. By saying that the government interpretation is the truth and anyone else's is a lie, government Members are insulting everyone who has given a little bit of thought or study to this Bill and the agreement and come up with any kind of interpretation different from the Government. What arrogance. That does not contribute to understanding of this deal.

The understanding or lack of understanding of this deal will be what will eventually defeat this free trade agreement. A voter faced with making a decision on the deal is being asked to choose between the *status quo* and something he or she does

not understand. If you are faced with that kind of a decision, you are going to choose the *status quo*. It would seem to be in the best interests of the Government if it were to help voters to understand.

Mr. McDermid: We are.

Mr. Hovdebo: However, there is the rub. The more the voters understand about this agreement, the more they disagree with it, and the Government is caught in a real dilemma.

Mr. McDermid: That is the NDP, accept the *status quo* or go backwards.

Mr. Hovdebo: I recognize the dilemma that government Members are faced with, and in the process I recognize that the action they are taking is to confuse the issue as much as possible. That is the only alternative they have. It is the only way out. If the people understand it, they will vote against it. If they do not understand it, they vote for the *status quo*.

I want to speak on Motion Nos. 17, 19 and 21 for just a minute. Motion No. 19 deletes Clause 9. Some day one of the provincial Governments is going to take Clause 9 to the courts and the Government is going to lose. It attempts to impose the will of this agreement on the provinces even if they do not want it. Premier Bourassa, who claims that he and everybody in Québec supports this Bill—although that is very doubtful—has decided that he could not face this elimination of provincial rights. If you cannot beat them, join them. He said he is going to, and has done it to some extent by passing permissive legislation which allows the Government to come in and do that, or he is going to pass it before the federal Government does, say it is already in place and therefore does not affect our rights at all.

Premier Peterson appears to be doing exactly the opposite. He is making sure he has legislation in place which this Bill will confront. We are going to have a confrontation between this Bill and provincial government law which will protect water, the wine industry and other products controlled by the provincial Government.

Ms. Copps: Pretty good Premier.

Mr. Hovdebo: Yes, he is.

That is what will happen as far as Motion No. 19 is concerned, so it makes sense to eliminate Clause 9 by accepting Motion No. 19.

With respect to Motion No. 21, a Liberal motion, although we accept the idea of broader representation on the government board dealing with the agreement, it must be recognized that this amendment does not require that there be farmers' groups, women's groups and multicultural groups on the board as well. We will support the amendment but it does lack a bit in that it does not recognize those groups I just mentioned in