Mr. Hopkins: —but the boundaries of Canada are not.

Mr. McDermid: Why?

Mr. Hopkins: So the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry simply brings in the following amendment:

That Bill C-130 be amended in Clause 2 by adding immediately after line 21 at page 2 the following:

"Canada" means the territory to which Canadian customs laws apply, including areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources".

What is wrong with a government that would deny an amendment like this which adds clarity to a Bill? Is it afraid that something is going to happen down the road that will irritate Washington? Does it not have enough confidence in the future of Canada to put in its boundaries? The Government should be ashamed of itself.

What is it really thinking about here? It is so anxious to get a deal that it does not want to go back and clarify anything. It wants a deal at any price.

Mr. Kilgour: It cannot be changed.

Mr. Hopkins: You did not speak on the amendment so you do not really have a right to shout over here. I am on the business of today, you were not.

This is one simple amendment to Bill C-130.

Mr. McDermid: "Simple" is a good word.

Mr. Hopkins: The Parliamentary Secretary stood up and said Bill C-130 amends 27 pieces of legislation. If you are going to amend 27 pieces of legislation why can you not allow a simple amendment that speaks about the territorial boundaries of Canada?

Mr. McDermid: Because it is already there.

Mr. Hopkins: I know what is bothering Members opposite. The U.S. sent the *Polar Sea* through the North and they said they were doing it because it was international waters. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) visited Washington and had a meeting with the State Department and they simply told him he might as well go back home and forget it, they were going to go through anyway.

Mr. McDermid: Do you think your amendment would have stopped the *Polar Sea* from going through?

Mr. Hopkins: The Government did not raise the issue until it was raised by the Official Opposition. Then Canadians woke up suddenly to find the Americans were passing through waters we claimed to be our own and there was nothing done to inhibit them. The Government, with the largest majority in Canada's history, did not stand up and speak for Canada. Today it is not standing up and speaking for Canada because it will not put the boundaries of Canada in the most major piece of legislation that has passed through this House in decades.

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Mr. McDermid: It is already there.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, let us go back to another day here that relates to this. Canada argued in 1903 that we owned the headlands on the West Coast. The U.S. was claiming we did not. Britain was brought into the picture and it supported the U.S. in its case and we lost. That is why today you have the American Panhandle down Canada's West Coast. What is going to happen in the future if the Americans claim certain waters in the Arctic to be international waters, send their ships through on that basis, and we say they are not international waters? If this amendment goes on to outline the clear-cut boundaries of Canada for the future—

Mr. McDermid: It stops that?

Mr. Hopkins: —it gives strength to our position when it comes to international law and future court cases dealing with the boundaries of Canada because it is there.

Mr. McDermid: It is already there.

Mr. Hopkins: It is already there? Why did you not put it in and clarify it?

Mr. McDermid: It is in the Customs Act, that is what we are talking about.

Mr. Hopkins: He says it is in the Customs Act. Why not put it directly into Bill C-130, because Bill C-130 takes precedence over many pieces of Canadian legislation. He knows that.

Mr. McDermid: That is wrong, too. That section was taken out of the Bill.

Mr. Hopkins: I talked about Britain and the U.S. ganging up on Canada in 1903, and it is happening in 1988. Here we have a trade Bill that is slanted towards the U.S. The boundaries of the U.S. are outlined in the Bill, the Government will not outline the boundaries of Canada because it is afraid of irritating Washington and it might lose its trade Bill. You know, you must not interfere with poor Uncle Sam. Yet we have the British Prime Minister, not sitting down at a table in this case, but walking into the Canadian House of Commons and supporting this trade agreement. It was totally out of order, but she did it anyway. Here you have Britain moving into this debate between Canada and the U.S., taking the part of the Tory Government in Canada, which already has an overwhelming majority in this House, and trying to convince Canadians that this is indeed the route to go.

We heard the Hon. Member for Edmonton—Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) saying that Switzerland and Japan were successful by themselves in the world market simply because of high quality products.

Mr. McDermid: And protectionism.

Mr. Hopkins: He also mentioned intelligence. Is the Hon. Member saying that Canadian goods are not of high quality?