

farmers who are already operating at saturation points and who just barely make ends meet.

These people are asking themselves, as are we, led by our trade critic, what kind of economic sense this kind of deal makes for the grape producing industry.

Given that there is a very limited growing season in Canada, given that the industry is under a barrage of competition, given that there is some pride in producing our own grapes and wines for domestic consumption, given that there are 1,500 jobs that will evaporate and disappear from the Okanagan Valley and the Niagara fruit belt, and given that there is already enough competition in the other tender fruit markets, what kind of government would not care about all those factors and would simply say: "This is the kind of deal you're going to get, take it or leave it"? That is why the grape producing farmers made the trip to Ottawa on Tuesday morning. They tried to sensitize the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) to their problem. I hope they will have an opportunity to do that another time, because it was impossible to do so on that day.

These people want the Government to understand that livelihoods are at stake. That is why the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry, the Liberal trade critic, moved Motion No. 19 to delete the clause that would do damage to these people. He did it to protect and respect an industry that has roots in Canada and that has a sense of pride. With some assistance, it might have a viable future.

It is no secret that this industry has had difficulties in the past, but that is not an excuse to trample over it completely. Instead, if it has had difficulties, that would be all the more reason for the Government to be extra sensitive to this industry that is trying to find its legs when entering into this kind of agreement. My colleague's Motion No. 19 provides a viable alternative. It is an amendment that has been put forward with a degree of urgency and with a degree of sensitivity.

Though I only have a few moments remaining in my time, I would like to deal with Motion No. 21 which I believe is a very fair motion. It would provide for an effective mechanism of consultation with Canadians. Motion No. 21 would ensure that various consumer, labour, and business interests would be represented on the various organizing structures that would oversee the application of this agreement.

It is bad enough that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) was against free trade in 1983. It is bad enough that the question of free trade was not debated in the last election. It is bad enough that the Government does not want to go to the people before officially ratifying this deal. Because the Government is timid and negligent in those three ways, we have moved Motion No. 21 which would ensure that Canadians who are involved in various interest groups would have a direct and meaningful partnership in deciding on and applying what will become known as the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal.

Message from the Senate

• (1530)

Mr. McDermid: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point or order. It has been the tradition in this House for a considerable length of time that we refer to Members of this House as Hon. Members or, if they hold a position with the Government, by that position. Throughout his speech the Hon. Member has been referring to a "Mulroney-Reagan trade deal". The title is the "Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement"; the other is not. I believe the Chair should draw to the attention of the Hon. Member that there is no such thing as that about which he is speaking.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Brampton—Georgetown is correct in his remarks. The Hon. Member for York West may conclude.

Mr. Marchi: It is very interesting that the Parliamentary Secretary gets on his feet to correct me in how I refer to this deal when he fails day after day to get to his feet to tell the House of Commons and Canadians that he will be reacting to our concern about the farmers in the Niagara fruit belt and the Okanagan Valley. Those are the real issues and the stands the Hon. Member for Brampton—Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) ought to be taking rather than pathetically getting to his feet to lament because I called this deal the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal. What is wrong with calling it the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for York West knows that he should not use personal names to refer to Members in the House. I hope the Hon. Member will remember that in future.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following Bills without amendment: Bill C-92, An Act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act; Bill C-145, An Act to amend various Acts to give effect to the reconstitution of the Quebec Provincial Court, Court of the sessions of the Peace and Youth Court as the Court of Quebec; Bill C-103, An Act to increase the opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts; and Bill C-30, An Act to amend the National Parks Act and to amend An Act to amend the National Parks Act.