

dispute over the Beaufort, the George's Bank, and the dispute involving the *Polar Sea* in the Arctic will all go in their favour.

The legislation defines the United States but it does not define what is Canada. I would like to put forward the proposition, bizarre though it may seem, that the reason the Government failed to include a definition of Canada is that it does not understand the fundamentals of this country, territorially, geographically or spiritually.

What happened when the Americans came into Canadian waters on the *Polar Sea*, uninvited? Did the Prime Minister stand up and fight for Canada? Did the Secretary of State for External Affairs say to the U.S. President that you are uninvited, unwelcome, and you had better clear out of our territory? The only person who was charged as a result of that incident was the pilot of a small Canadian plane hired by the Council of Canadians who actually flew over the *Polar Sea* and dropped a Canadian flag on the deck. He did that so the Americans would know that in this country we understand what a territorial border means and we respect that.

The Prime Minister of Canada, kneeling as he usually does, to the President, did not say a thing to the Americans. Neither did the Secretary of State for External Affairs. However, a charge of dropping a dangerous object was laid against the pilot who flew that plane. That dangerous object was a Canadian flag. That pilot was charged with dropping a dangerous object on a boat which should not have been in Canadian waters in the first place.

That is why, in the context of this enabling legislation, we do not take the words of the Parliamentary Secretary who says "trust me", or the words of the Prime Minister who said that seniors citizens' pensions will never be touched. They are a sacred trust. We know what the words of the Government mean. They mean very little, and that is why we need a definition in law so our resources are protected both onshore and offshore. We will then be able to tell future trespassers on Canadian territory that by our law they have violated the agreement.

Yet the Canadian Government, in an obtuse, maniacal way, is trying to thrust a Bill on the Canadian people that will do nothing more than attempt to save the Prime Minister's political hide. Let's face it, the article in yesterday's *Citizen* was quite true. His own Party thinks the Prime Minister has a severe image problem with the public. He has a personality problem. People do not trust him. How is he going to be able to pull this one out of the bag? He has only one hope. He has to convince the Canadian public that somehow the trade deal is more important than his own character flaws. Unfortunately, he is afraid to see the trade deal illuminated in all its pieces, including a very fundamental lack of a definition of Canada. He is afraid to let the Canadian public see the details of the Bill and the agreement.

Today we saw the secret memorandum which was kept in the Ministry of Finance which basically told consumers that the people who may benefit from these—

Business of the House

Mr. McDermid: When are you going to start telling the truth for a change?

Ms. Copps:—alleged tariff reductions, 20 per cent though they may be, may be the retailers or wholesalers but it will not flow through to consumers. The Parliamentary Secretary is very anxious to speak from his seat, but unfortunately he has refused to give the Canadian people an opportunity to review this document in detail.

We believe this amendment is fundamental. We believe the definition of Canada with respect to asserting its territorial sovereignty is critical. That is why we feel this is a very supportable amendment. Certainly it will at least begin to put some flesh on the bones of legislation which is literally on the way to selling out Canada.

I hope the Hon. Member stands up and speaks, but I do not take the word of a Government and Prime Minister which has given us four years of broken promises. I want to see it in law. Any person in this Chamber who has practised law will know—

Mr. McDermid: Have you?

Ms. Copps:—that if it is not in the law, all the alleged good intentions of politicians and others mean absolutely nothing.

Mr. Dick: That is not true.

Ms. Copps: Why would the Government bring forward legislation that defines U.S. territory but not Canada? It is because the Government does not understand what Canada is all about. It does not understand what Canadians are all about. It is up to the Opposition through the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry to move this amendment in order finally to put a definition of Canada in this Bill.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There have been discussions between the Parties, and we appreciate their co-operation on this matter. I think you will find there is unanimous consent to the Government calling Bill C-145 and dealing with it in all stages without debate today and then immediately proceeding to Private Members' Hour.

• (1400)

Bill C-145 is 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. The Bill stands in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member's proposal?