

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

We need a definition of Canada that is not only written into this legislation but is one that members of the Conservative Party have in their hearts and minds. We need a definition of Canada that will look at Canada as a nation that has developed in a distinct, separate way from that of the United States, a nation that has a contribution to make to our world and that is being foreclosed by this trade agreement.

I urge all Hon. Members to support this grouping of amendments moved by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). Even more than that, I think we have to move to give the people of Canada a chance to make their voices heard in this issue and to decide whether they want Canada to remain as a distinct society, or do they want to see our tax laws and eventually our social programs merged with those of the United States so that we will in fact become the 52nd or the 53rd state.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, it is very peculiar that on a Friday afternoon, when dealing with such an important amendment, the Government would be silent. There have already been four speakers, and I am the fifth, who have spoken on this amendment, which is of significance for reasons that have been explained and which I will explain as well. However, the Government is silent, and that is very peculiar.

Has the Government decided that it has a sufficient majority and that it is so drunk with arrogance that it does not have to reply?

**Mr. Dick:** We know what a filibuster is.

**Mr. Caccia:** If the Government had replied to the first speaker, perhaps we would have already moved to another amendment. However, we are still waiting to be enlightened by the Government on this matter.

It might be interesting for those who do not have the text of the Bill before them to know that in the interpretation of Bill C-130, there is a very thorough definition of the United States. It reads:

“United States” means

- (a) the customs territory of the United States, including the fifty states of the United States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico,
- (b) the foreign trade zones located in the United States and Puerto Rico, and
- (c) any areas beyond the territorial sea of the United States within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, the United States may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and the natural resources thereof.”

One would then want to know where Canada fits into this agreement. This amendment is being put forward because the United States is mentioned many times in the Bill and is defined. Canada, however, is mentioned many times in the Bill but is not defined. Therefore, it is a very legitimate amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). He is asking the Government and the backbenchers on the government side why it is that Canada is not

included in the interpretation of this Bill. Why is there this imbalance? This is what we cannot understand.

I am the fifth speaker on this amendment. The Government has been silent. I would hope that the Government would find the courage and the intellectual pride to give us an explanation as to why a definition of Canada is missing. This is an international trade agreement, with emphasis on the word “international”. This is why in the interpretation there is a definition of one of the two parties to the agreement. Why is the other missing? We invite the Government to reply. Give us an explanation. Why does the Bill go on at great length defining the United States but not Canada? Not at all.

• (1350)

These are not rhetorical questions. They relate to the very substance of the Bill. They refer to the international incidents the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry referred to some 40 minutes ago. Yet all we have is silence.

Evidently the Government is embarrassed. Evidently it does not have a good answer. Evidently it feels that when it comes to the vote, it has the majority to steamroller us regardless of whether or not it gives us an answer. That would be most unfortunate. I hope the Government has enough pride in and respect for this institution to get up very soon today and give us an answer.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that no Member on the government side has an answer to the fundamental question posed here today. Where is the Parliamentary Secretary with respect to the definition of Canada? I would be very happy to allow Members on the government side, so few in number though they may be, who are interested in this issue—

**Mr. McDermid:** Look around you.

**Ms. Copps:** —tell us as to why it is there is no definition of Canada.

**Mr. McDermid:** Sit down and I will tell you.

**Ms. Copps:** The Minister responsible, who never even read the document, would probably stand up and say “trust me”. We heard that before. We heard that about senior citizens’ pensions.

As was pointed out by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), what happened there in the first year of the Government’s mandate when sovereignty was threatened by the *Polar Sea* was that you had the Prime Minister on the one hand saying it was not an incursion, and on the other hand you had the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) saying it was. They were playing ping pong on the issue. The American Congress must have been laughing. They must have had a big chuckle because they know that if Canada brings forward enabling legislation which does not define what Canada is, then obviously the territorial