

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

**Mr. McDermid:** First of all, the reason for defining the United States in this particular part of the Act, in the second section under "interpretation", is because we had to define their customs territory. That was very important, because we are dealing in customs matters. That is why they are defined in there. Under the free trade agreement, we amend many different Acts that pertain to United States goods and services, and to those of other countries. So, the United States is mentioned in those amendments, and we had to define their customs territory, and that is what we have done here. That is very important to understand why that definition is here.

As far as Canada is concerned, Canada and its areas beyond the territorial seas are already defined. This may come as a surprise to the Hon. Member, but they are already defined for the purpose of laws relating to customs as follows. There are three areas that he should be aware of.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Where is it defined in the agreement?

**Mr. Riis:** Show us in the Bill.

**Mr. McDermid:** In the Customs Act, Canada is defined to include the land mass of Canada. That shows the ignorance of the Hon. Member in not understanding the free trade agreement. There is somebody that has not even opened the first page. He does not even know what he is talking about. I would advise him just to sit still.

**Mr. Riis:** We will wait for five minutes and then you can sit down.

**Mr. McDermid:** Canada is defined in the Customs Act to include the land mass of Canada, the internal waters and the territorial sea. Definitions in the Customs Act—a surprise for the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy)—apply to the Customs Tariff. Therefore, Canada is defined for the purpose of the Act. As well, the Customs and Excise Offshore Application Act, which applies Canadian laws relating to customs and excise to designated goods within the limits of the Continental Shelf, defines the Continental Shelf to mean the seabed and sub-soil beyond the territorial seas of Canada. Canada is totally covered under the free trade agreement and defined under the Customs Act.

• (1610)

Clearly, that is what we are talking about. We are talking about customs' areas. If the Hon. Member had called the Trade Negotiations Office and asked, that would have been the explanation he would have received. For him to say that negotiators from the Trade Negotiations Office said that everybody knows where Canada is and it is not necessary is totally wrong. It is a totally false statement.

Therefore Motions Nos. 1, 61 and 65 are totally unnecessary and should be defeated.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, first, I think that the Parliamentary Secretary should be questioned

as to why he began his remarks reflecting on the Chair. I can say nothing else but that he reflected on the Chair in a totally mean-spirited and unnecessary fashion.

**Mr. Riis:** Shameful.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** The Parliamentary Secretary, after going through some compliments addressed to the people who worked on the Speaker's ruling, in effect through his language verbally trashed the ruling. He said that the amendments which the Speaker ruled in order were trivial and unnecessary amendments which had already been rejected at committee. I think this is quite improper. If the Speaker uses the authority given him by this House to say that amendments are in order and acceptable for debate in this House then it is not for the Parliamentary Secretary, in spite of his arrogance and that of the Government's, to tell the Speaker that he was wrong, and because the Government considers the amendments in question to be trivial and unnecessary they are not to be accepted and not to be debated in this House.

**Mr. McDermid:** There you go telling untruths again.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** I also want to say that I think that it was quite wrong for the Parliamentary Secretary to reflect on the actions of Members of this House in putting down moved in committee. This is something provided for by the rules, the rules adopted by all Members of this House. The Members of this House have a perfect right to put down amendments which were not moved in committee. I think it is wrong for the Parliamentary Secretary to reflect as he did on the intentions and motives of those Members of the House who tabled amendments which had not first been put forward in committee.

What the Parliamentary Secretary was saying is illustrative of the whole approach of the Government on this matter. The approach of members of the Government is: "We know what we are doing. We are right. Everyone else should yield to us without question or debate because if they do not do that we will steamroller them out of the way. We will push them aside". They may be able to use their majority in this House for that purpose up to a point. However, it is not yet clear how far they can go. I say this. They are not yet in a position to tell the Speaker, much less Members of the House, that the Speaker was wrong in accepting amendments and it was his authority to do so and that Members of the House were going beyond their right and their duty in tabling amendments which they thought appropriate to put before the House.

I also say this to you, Mr. Speaker. The public is increasingly aware of the blind arrogance of the Government and they will make their judgment on that arrogance when they vote in an election. I say that no matter what use is made, what abuse is made by the Government of its majority on this matter in the House it will still not prevail before the will of the people of this country who do not want to see this deal imposed on them because they think it is an absolute sell-out of what they