

The next point that is being made is to the effect that the agreement impairs provincial policy-making through the undertaking of the federal Government to ensure that all necessary measures are taken to ensure the observance of the agreement, including by the provinces and the municipalities. Enough has been said on that point by colleagues in my Party who have stressed this very point in an eloquent manner.

● (1940)

Following that point, reference is made to the national treatment rule. In general, that rule requires that American business interests be accorded treatment equivalent to that granted to Canadians. Many things are likely to change under this national treatment rule. When there is such a difference in the proportion and relation of strength and size between the United States and Canada, evidently the national treatment rule will go to the advantage of the economy that can muster the largest economic units and the largest economic corporations and, therefore, will be able to enter the neighbouring market with a much greater impact and success than we will be able. We all know of this relationship of roughly one to ten.

The analysis by the Attorney General of Ontario is also interesting because it also goes into the study of the most severe effects on provincial activity. It concludes that provincial activities—and I submit that this will not only be the case for Ontario—will ultimately be felt in a number of areas. The first one raised here is energy. The point is made very briefly. The scope of two-price energy policies as a provincial tool for economic development will be restricted.

We have been saying this, we have heard this from witnesses in committee, and here we see it confirmed through an analysis by the office of the provincial Attorney General. It means the restriction of advantages that we have enjoyed until now as a nation to use the edge that we have through energy prices whereby in the 1970s and until recently we used lower prices for our own domestic purposes. Therefore, we will lose this advantage which was understandably one that we had to use considering the geographic disadvantages in trying to keep an economy such as ours together over such a large geographic area, and also climatically. Sooner or later we were bound to initiate a policy of price differentials on energy. All of a sudden as a result of the weak, short-sighted attitude of the Government we are giving up the natural, highly desirable, and almost essential tool that we have been able to utilize until now.

Second, the impact on provincial activities will be felt on natural resources which, under the agreement, are subject to compulsory sharing. I repeat the word "compulsory" sharing. This is something that has somehow become lost in the perception on the part of the public. They are subject to compulsory sharing with the United States in times of shortage and for which licensing for commercial use and access must be accorded equally to Canadians and Americans. No comment is needed since this is self-explanatory. The fact is that now we are going to share. We will be forced to share regardless of our

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

long-term interests and regardless of our environmental approach to our natural resources which we may want to have, keeping in mind not only the next generation, but the second or third generation. This will be a very serious restriction on our ability to move.

I notice that you are becoming impatient with my time allocation, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am never impatient with the Hon. Member, but his time has expired.

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, this is the most abhorrent piece of legislation that I have ever had the misfortune to have to speak on in the House. The three amendments before us are very fundamental ones. If these amendments were passed, they would take out the guts of Bill C-130, the Act to implement the free trade deal with the United States. I have no hope whatsoever that Members of the Government who are supporting the trade deal will accept these very reasonable amendments. They are reasonable in the sense of the life of our country and in the sense of what we need to be doing. I do not have much optimism, and I am directing my remarks through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Canadian people.

Here we are in August. We are debating late at night at a time when the House is normally suspended in order that we can spend time in our constituencies. We are debating an issue which the Government has no mandate to be dealing with, an issue which is complex, which is disturbing Canadians, which Canadians want to have an election on, and which Canadians want to understand. Some Canadians are very open to the idea. They are very open to the principles of the trade deal because they want to see lower tariffs and what they consider to be economic rationality.

However, the actual details of the Bill and the substance of the agreement are not well known because the Government has deceived the people of Canada by putting out a glossy PR approach on the subject and by making it look a purely economic matter when in fact it is a constitutional change that will change the life of our country forever if it is allowed to go through. It is a constitutional amendment because it is binding on future Governments. Some of the very clauses that are up for amendment are binding on the future.

First, I wish to deal with Clause 3. The purpose of the amendment is that the whole clause be deleted. It is the general purpose clause of the Bill and it states:

3. The purpose of this Act is to implement the Agreement, the objectives of which are to

(a) eliminate barriers to trade in goods and services between Canada and the United States;

Precious little study was done of services before the deal was hastily rushed through by a government with no mandate whatsoever. We have not seen any Conservative bolting on this issue. People who, before the last election, were against trade, people who never said a word against their Prime Minister