

Nova Scotian communities: opportunities to decrease the economic and environmental costs of shipping, boost local economies by allowing more money to circulate in the local economy longer, facilitate local employment, and generate income that contributes to the local tax base.

Under pressures to open up more of our local economy and public services to the private sector, government decisions may be increasingly subject to claims through the investor-state dispute resolution systems proposed for the CETA. Our experience with NAFTA raises red-flags.

Take for example the case that is being brought by Bilcon against the government of Nova Scotia. Bilcon is particularly displeased that the Environmental Review Panel that decided against the company's proposal for a quarry included consideration of whether it fit with the community's 'core values'. With more than \$188 million on the line in this one case, the possibility of serious social and financial repercussions exists.

The trend to increasing investor-state litigation and the risk of substantial payouts of public money to private companies for potential profit loss is a serious disincentive - chilling policies that support local, community-based development. This is especially concerning given that the federal government has said it will look to reclaim costs associated with international trade processes.

The CETA threatens the province's ability to enact fair drug pricing policy because the proposed changes to Canada's drug patent system would add approximately \$70-million annually to Nova Scotia's prescription drug costs.

A cornerstone of Nova Scotia's renewable energy strategy is support for local producers who contribute to the system and will help bring the province up to the 15% by 2015 goal, but this could be interpreted as

an unfair advantage by the Europeans, opening us up to potential for an investor-state complaint.

It is also too risky to assume that Nova Scotia farmers, in particular dairy operations, can withstand an increase in European imports or be able to increase their access the European markets. Rather, European imports could effectively undermine supply-management and do significant damage to our dairy sector.

The CETA could also open up post-secondary education to greater numbers of private companies. This means, for example, a privately-funded, for-profit business or medical school could be set up in Nova Scotia, and the government would be powerless to prevent it or exercise any control over how it operates.

All of these sectoral examples provide evidence that the CETA could have serious implications for our province.

Undertaking this analysis was difficult because of the lack of transparency about the specifics of the CETA, and the lack of up-to-date specific data related to Nova Scotia. Without further evidence to the contrary, our report concludes that the probable costs of the CETA greatly outweigh the benefits for Nova Scotia. Merely opening up the possibility for greater competition in Europe will not automatically create economic benefits for Nova Scotians. It is more likely to mean that European companies have easier access to Nova Scotia consumers and public spending.

There are costs associated with trade and investment treaties, especially ones as sweeping in coverage as the CETA. Nova Scotians deserve information and data weighing the full economic and social costs and benefits.

Please note that this is a summary of a larger document. The full report, Who pays for 'free' trade? The CETA and Nova Scotia by Angela Giles, Leanne MacMillan and Christine Saulnier, can be downloaded free at www.policyalternatives.ca



CANADIAN CENTRE
for POLICY ALTERNATIVES
NOVA SCOTIA OFFICE
www.policyalternatives.ca
tel:902-477-1252 or 1-800-920-7770

These fast facts can be reproduced as an oped or opinion piece without obtaining further permission, provided they are not edited and full credit is given to both the author and the source, CCPA-NS.