

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Investment prospects for additional facilities needed to increase production in the petrochemical industries will mean a more secure future for the petrochemical sector, a future for our young people. We will no longer just pump our oil and ship it elsewhere, we will build plants, we will create jobs, we will ship quality finished goods at competitive prices to the markets in the south.

Albertans know what they want. They want to maintain their right to ownership, their right to levy royalties and their right to determine the rate of production. This is important to Albertans. With the Free Trade Agreement, these rights are guaranteed.

Today, in an article in *The Ottawa Citizen* the President of Novacor Chemicals of Calgary, one of Alberta's natural gas producers, states that his company stands to save \$30 million in tariffs. What will he do with those savings? It has already been decided. He will open a third ethylene plant. This means more jobs, in fact 200 permanent positions. Without free trade this project could not have gone forward. Competition does not phase him. His company is willing to compete with the U.S. producers.

Expansion in all areas of the economy will mean a broader based economy, with more jobs going to all Canadians. Under the Free Trade Agreement the Canadian Government can continue to provide funds for economic growth and development, if the objective is to eliminate social, economic and industrial disadvantages.

Government structures like the Western Diversification Office can still provide creative assistance to develop markets in areas where Albertans may have a competitive edge. Tariff-free access to the U.S. market can only enhance export opportunities for the Alberta petrochemical and livestock industries. Small businessmen will be able to achieve their full potential and our mining operators will have access to a larger market.

Albertans recognized these opportunities when they voted for free trade. That is why I am here today. Albertans have already said yes and I now say yes to this very important agreement.

Mr. MacWilliam: Mr. Chairman, this is my first opportunity to speak in the House and thank my constituents back home in Okanagan—Shuswap for placing their confidence in me as their representative here in Ottawa. I want to send my best wishes for a very joyous holiday season to those at home who are viewing tonight.

I was sent to Ottawa for a very specific reason. It was to provide a voice of concern from the West, from British Columbia in particular and the Okanagan—Shuswap area. It is a voice of concern that would stand up and be counted with regard to the trade deal that is facing us today.

I am delighted to take my stand here tonight and oppose the implementation of Bill C-2 and oppose this trade deal because it is not a deal on free trade. It is not even fair trade. It is a sell-out of Canada's resources. It is a sell-out of Canada's future.

Let me go into a brief history of this trade deal. It is not the first time that the subject of free trade has been before the Chamber. I want to quote some voices of history who have talked on this most important topic before:

The American title, by right of our manifest destiny, is to overspread and possess the whole of this continent which providence hath provided us. Texas is secure and so now, who is our next customer? Shall it be California or shall it be Canada?

Those were the words of John O'Sullivan who, in 1891, set the stage for the first debate on free trade. As we all know, that debate ended when Sir John A. Macdonald won a Canadian election on this very issue and turned back the American free traders at the 49th parallel. Macdonald said that free trade with the U.S. would inevitably lead to annexation and asked how Canada could keep its political independence when it had thrown away its economic independence.

• (2100)

We all have a feeling for history in this House. As we all know, the trade issue arose again in 1911 when the Laurier Government negotiated a free trade deal with President Taft to reduce tariffs on a broad range of natural products and manufactured items. The agreement sailed through the U.S. House of Representatives, supported by the Speaker of the Assembly who said at that time:

I am for it, this reciprocity agreement, because I hope to see the day when the American flag will float over every square foot of British North America clear to the North Pole.

Former Liberal Leader Edward Blake broke with the Laurier Government over that issue and stated that free trade was the same as commercial union and would lead to political union with the United States.

Once again the issue was raised and fought, and this time, for those Hon. Members who are so verbose on the other side of the House, the issue—