

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

are in favour or opposed to free trade or whether Canadians ought to have a decision before this deal becomes officially ratified, one of the areas of concern that crosses over provincial and regional lines, economic and social lines, is the question of sovereignty. It is the question of the ability of the people of this youthful, energetic and dynamic country to decide for themselves what directions and aspirations they want to set forth.

As we start off this very important and historic debate for all Canadians, these amendments speak to a fundamental deficiency that I think is symbolic of the Government's entire initiative on the free trade front. When you stop and read Bill C-130, you find that the Government set forth to define what is meant in clear terms by this agreement. It defined what is meant by the word "commission", it defined what is meant by the word "Minister", and it defined what is meant by the word "prescribe", and finally it defined what "the United States" means. As was outlined very ably and articulately by our trade spokesperson, our Canadian Government forgot to define what it means to live in this country through the omission of stating very categorically and clearly what it is we define our Canadian territory to be. It would seem to me that, in a Bill of this magnitude, the Government would at least start from a point of strength, from a point of departure that would put clearly on paper and in writing our undisputed rights and territory as a nation, rather than allowing those very definitions to be interpreted by the Americans, or any other country, as they see fit.

Is it any wonder when you talk about sovereignty that Canadians begin to worry, that they begin to think of themselves as second-class citizens in the face of the Americans? Is it any wonder, when you ask Canadians, who do you think got the better end of the deal, who do you think the better negotiators were, who do you think gave up the most, or who do you think wanted this deal the most, they answer that across the bargaining table the Americans were clearly the victors?

This trade deal starts off by not defining and not recognizing what we as a country and as Canadians have every right to put on the record categorically and clearly, what we think this territory is all about that speaks to the sovereignty of this nation.

The Member from Winnipeg—Fort Garry moments ago pointed out the whole question and experience of the *Polar Sea* incident, the ridicule that Canadians felt as the American vessel went through our waters. Then, to add insult to injury, the Americans said they did not have to check with us and they did not have to get prior approval. What did we do about it? What about the insult Newfoundlanders felt when the Canadian Government put out a colour-coded map for our young students and had the Province of Newfoundland coloured under the United States of America. Those are the symbolic gestures that raise the concern and aspirations of Canadians.

Every Canadian wants to have a brighter economic future. Every Canadian is worried about future generations enjoying a lifestyle that we in this Chamber and our ridings are fortunate to share. They are not willing to do that at the cost of the inherent value of being Canadian and the inherent feeling of being in control of one's own destiny, in feeling the pride that comes with being the architects of our own decisions and ultimately in designing our future as we see fit. Therefore, it is very appropriate indeed that the Liberal Party, in the first seconds of this very important debate, in the opening lines of the free trade legislation that we are studying, is trying to amend and encourage the Government of Canada to recognize what is ours.

Let us recognize in the opening lines of our free trade legislation, or the Mulroney-Reagan trade legislation, what is indeed ours in a proud, profound and categorical manner. That is what our amendments strive to do. They do not strive to do the impossible, but what is expected of any national, sovereign government of the people. If the Conservative Government cannot muster the fortitude to send a signal to the Americans and to the world stating what is clearly ours, then they really do not deserve the opportunity of being at the head of the ship of state. They ought to stand up and be pro-Canadian. They ought to stand up and define what is ours, discuss the vision for those two countries, and then let the people decide which vision they want to embrace.

Very fundamentally and very early on, the Government has taken the time to define everything else, but it has left out our own country, Canada. We think that is very symbolic of what is troubling in this legislation. We are asking the House and, more important, the Government to recognize that deficiency, to recognize that fallacy, to recognize the ridicule and the embarrassment for any Canadian who happens to pick up this piece of legislation and recognizes that the Government has taken the time to define what is the United States of America but has forgotten to define, promote and defend what is clearly ours and what makes up this country.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words on the first grouping of these amendments, which I am very happy to support.

In this first grouping we are dealing with the fact that the Tories lack any definition of Canada. When I say that, I do not simply refer to Bill C-130. The Conservative Party today, unlike the traditional Conservative Party, does not seem to have a very clear understanding of what Canada is all about. If it did have, it would not have entered into this trade agreement in the first place. The Conservative Party does not recognize that historically Canada has had a different tradition of government involvement in the economy, in culture and in social affairs than has the United States. The United States generally has followed the dictum, I believe, of Thomas Jefferson, a great American. He said that government is best which governs least. Canadians, because of our history and