

between Newfoundland and the United States. This Minister attempts, some 40 years later to achieve through the back door what he could not achieve through the front door 40 years ago. This time it is not economic union between Newfoundland and the United States. I tell him that Canadians are a quiet people. We are placid people. We do not wear our emotions on our sleeves nor do we practise our nationalism like they do in the United States. Scratch a Canadian, in particular a new Canadian from Newfoundland, Canada's newest province, only that deep and you will find a backbone of steel.

● (2010)

The people of Canada will not give away their country in the interest of a corporate climate put together by a Government that has no sense of nation, no sense of sovereignty, and no respect for the fundamental concept and value of a nation on the northern half of the North American continent called Canada. We will not lay down and die, Madam Speaker. This deal must be rejected.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claudy Mailly (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, before speaking to this Bill, to explain why my riding massively supports the free trade agreement—not just the principle of free trade but this agreement in particular—I would like to inform the Hon. Member . . .

[English]

He is always good for about 10 minutes of entertainment. For instance, he has forgotten to mention—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Maily: Shut up. He has forgotten to mention, when he was talking about selling out Canada, that on page 265—

[Translation]

Mr. Rossi: Sit down, Maily! Sit down! You don't even know how to behave in the House of Commons. Go back to your riding, they don't want you here!

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Hon. Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) on a point of order.

Mr. Nunziata: Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member just speaking is a Parliamentary Secretary. Her answer to Canadians and those who oppose this particular agreement is to "shut up", to quote her words. The Hon. Member should know that those words are unparliamentary. But I would ask you, Madam Speaker, to direct the Parliamentary Secretary, the Hon. Member who has the floor, to withdraw those insulting remarks that she has made to opposition Members.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I am sure the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily) will do the right thing.

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

[Translation]

Mrs. Maily: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would refer, for instance, to page 265 of the free trade agreement to show that what the Hon. Member just said had no basis in fact, to put it politely, and we read the following:

. . . Canada retains the right to review the acquisition of firms in Canada by U.S. investors but has agreed to phase in higher threshold levels for direct acquisitions . . . These changes to the Investment Canada Review Process will not apply to the oil and gas and uranium sectors.

So what is he talking about? He is leaving, Madam Speaker, because he knows perfectly well that what I am saying is the plain truth. It doesn't apply to the resource sector, and he knows that.

An Hon. Member: Disinformation!

[English]

Moreover, a previous speaker, the Hon. Member for Yorkton—Melville (Mr. Nystrom), surprised me very much today when he started quoting from polls on the free trade agreement, suggesting that because the polls were divided evenly it made the free trade agreement a bad agreement.

I remember when we had the debate on capital punishment and he said that polls did not matter even though 82 per cent of the people were for capital punishment and that what we had to do was the right thing. He was against capital punishment. Now the Member is telling us that the polls are right and that we must not do the right thing, that we must just follow whatever the polls tell us.

He omitted to say when he was quoting particular sections on investment that he skipped a few lines. I will quote them in French because I have the French text here. It says:

[Translation]

The obligation to grant national treatment does not mean that such treatment must be identical in every respect.

[English]

That means the same. It does not have to be the same. There is no customs union. There is no giving away our identity. It goes on to say:

[Translation]

A party may grant different treatment for legitimate reasons such as consumer protection or security, to the extent that the treatment is otherwise equivalent. Furthermore, regulations may not be used as disguised barriers to trade.

It also says:

The parties must ensure that licence criteria are not discriminatory.

The agreement also says:

That these undertakings are prospective. In other words, they do not oblige either government to change its current legislation and practice.

Further on in the same article it says:

That the agreement does not prohibit the negotiation of product mandate, research and development and technology transfer requirements with investors.