

two partners, one of which is ten times the size of the other? What a preposterous suggestion that we will have any kind of fair or effective dispute settlement mechanism.

I have one minute in which to finish dealing with the substance of an extremely important matter, a matter on which Canadians want the Government to level with them, want to understand and want to know what is happening.

Let me refer to clause 3(e) which reads:

lay the foundation for further bilateral and multilateral co-operation to expand and enhance the benefits of the Agreement

The benefits for whom? This is a one-sided agreement. It is a sell-out agreement. The Government wants further co-operation to sell out the few areas which have so far not been exempted, the cultural area, the investment area and so forth. This is a travesty, Mr. Speaker. The Government ought to be ashamed of itself. I can assure you that we will continue to be speaking to these amendments to this trade deal which is a sell-out of our country.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak on these three amendments, Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8. I want to concentrate especially on Motion No. 8 which proposes to eliminate Clause 6 in the Bill.

The Tories when they were in opposition always talked about the importance of respecting the rights and responsibility of provincial Governments. They waxed eloquent about it in the 1980 and 1984 elections and about how the resources belonged to the provinces. Yet clause 6 in the Bill is designed for the federal Government to override all kinds of provincial jurisdiction. The Government will have a chance to do this with legislation which has been brought into the Ontario Legislature which will be passed and which provides for adjustment for the wine industry over a twelve-year period. We will see if this Bill is ever implemented, and I do not believe it will be—but if it were to be implemented at some time in the future, the Government of Canada will have to write regulations to override the power of the provincial Government to implement its schedules, costs and pricing of provincial wines. We will see Clause 6 eventually before the Supreme Court of Canada if this Bill ever becomes the law of the land.

If we look at what the Government has done to the grape and wine industry, it is so typical of the whole trade deal because the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said in 1983 that he was not in favour of free trade, that you would hear no more from him about it, yet here we have the most massive sell-out of our country in this trade deal in 100 years. It is interesting that about three weeks before the deal was signed in early October, 1987, the then Minister of International Trade—we have been through about three of them and I understand we are getting ready for another one fairly soon because the current Minister is not impressing anybody with his lack of knowledge of the deal—sent a letter to the grape producers in British Columbia saying that the Government

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

realized the grape and wine industry, if it were ever to be brought under the purview of this Prime Minister's trade deal, would require a 10 or 12 year adjustment period. Yet three weeks after that letter was sent, a deal was signed. Essentially the industry is put out of business because 50 per cent of the advantageous pricing is wiped out in the first 12 months of the deal, that is, January 1, 1989 to January 1, 1990.

This comes only three or four months after the Minister had given us a pledge and signed a letter that she realized there would have to be a 10 or 12 year adjustment period. The Ontario Government is providing an adjustment period. However, the B.C. Government has jumped on the bandwagon. Its Premier loves to jump on any bandwagon that is going through town, and B.C. is wiping out the advantages to B.C. wine growers almost immediately.

We have Clause 6 which will eventually, if this agreement is ever implemented, result in regulations being written against the Province of Ontario and against any other province. We hear some of the western Tory Premiers saying, "It is okay. We want the deal in". It is interesting to hear the Premier of Saskatchewan say that. Most of his province does not want the deal. He has spent millions of dollars running around the Province saying what a wonderful deal this is and holding public information meetings. Yet the recent Environics poll showed that Saskatchewan has the strongest opposition of any province in the country to the deal.

• (2000)

Some 50 per cent are opposed and very strongly opposed to it. Less than 30 per cent are in favour of the deal. I predict that if Clause 6 were ever implemented and regulations were written to override provincial jurisdictions, whether in the service sector, the energy sector or any other sector the Government would negotiate during the five or six-year negotiation period, then we would hear the screams, yells and catcalls from people like the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Premier of Alberta.

This is a very Draconian measure. The Government wanted to go ahead with this. Obviously it was a deal made at the Québec summit between the Prime Minister and the President. The President of the United States had made a deal with the grape growers and wine producers of California to allow their low priced grapes into Canada.

The Prime Minister seems to delight in pleasing the President of the United States, whether by sacrificing the grape growers and wine producers or by satisfying rich bagmen in the drug industry. He says: "If you want our energy, come and get it. We will guarantee it to you for all times, in perpetuity, and at our prices. We will guarantee you the share you have had for the last three years, so get your share up to 50 per cent. Regardless of what happens, if we have shortages, we will tough it out because that is what the deal says". It is a deal made in heaven for the United States. It has been trying to get our resources for years and years.