

that we are not prepared to defend those rights? That is the reason for this amendment.

● (1320)

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start in this historic debate by first saying that I think the amendments which have been brought forward by my friend from Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) are sensible and straightforward. It is something that I hope the Government will look at with care and will accept.

I think, at the start of this discussion, at the report stage of the Bill and on this first amendment, that one should also put certain points on the record. One should, for instance, impress heavily on the record the fact that in the legislative committee, where where this and other amendments were considered, a major fight was fought to see to it that across this country people would have a chance to be able to make presentations to this committee. I found it unfortunate that that was not accepted by the committee itself. I found, too, as I looked at the legislation which was in front of us, that the more groups we heard from, the more groups that spoke to us, the more the gaps came out in this Bill. We saw areas, from water to environmental concerns, to our territorial concerns, which had been considered but were not considered in this Bill.

We also felt that there was a certain degree within the committee itself of avoiding what was the major question which came before us again and again as groups called, and still call, for an election in this country, to see to it that they have a say in what happens to them and to their country in the future. Therefore, we have put forward a number of amendments. We have put forward amendments which take, for instance, the United States law and recognize some of the points which are made within that law, which make the United States law supreme over the agreement itself. We were not prepared, in our discussions in committee, to do that, and I deeply regret that because it means that United States law will dominate this agreement.

We were not prepared to respond to United States moves which have been put before us in their legislation, as to how they were prepared to move on subsidies. We felt that it was necessary, in a Bill from this House, to take the same position. We felt that provincial rights should be discussed, protected and safeguarded in this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: Concerning auto performance requirements, automobiles are very important to my constituency, but they have been desperately important to the whole revival of the economy of Canada throughout this past five years. That revival, I think, requires us to keep our freedom of action with respect to the auto sector.

It is also crucial that we maintain our concern and our control with respect to energy policy. There are parts of this

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Bill which are before us, to which we will be moving amendments which will very clearly take away the power of Canada to shape its energy policy in the future, while leaving the United States with the power to do so through its federal energy regulatory commission.

We also have a desperate need to look into the human casualties of this trade Bill, and there will be human casualties. The Government likes to talk of human casualties being very minimal. I guess, as one who has looked at adjustment restructuring throughout the world, this kind of major industrial restructuring, agricultural restructuring, social restructuring, services restructuring, is going to bring us, as a country, a lot of human casualties, who will have to be something that we respond to with humanity, with care, with passion.

So I am pleased to see this debate start today. I am pleased to see it start with this particular set of amendments, which set out for all of us to recognize that where we should start from is our definition of Canada, our territorial definition, of course, but also our definition of what we want to see for the future of Canada. Do we want to see a direction which takes us into closer and closer integration with the United States? Do we want to see a future where our children consider themselves essentially Americans? Is that what we want to see? I do not think so. I do not think so and I do not think that this House of Commons should therefore support great parts of this Bill.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: That is why we have moved these amendments. I also feel—and I say this with the greatest possible sincerity that I can muster—that it is absolutely ludicrous to make a major change in the future of our country, a fundamental shift which Canadians have fought in my constituency since the war of 1812, without their being able to have a say through an election, to see to it that there is a chance for them to shape the future of this country.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: We, therefore, will support these amendments. We will support other amendments, but above all, we will fight as hard as we possibly can fight to see to it that this Bill does not go through this House of Commons, that it is stopped, and that this Government is forced to go to the people and to let the people have their say, to let the people of Canada make the final decision on this crucial issue to the future of our country.

● (1330)

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to second the set of amendments moved by my colleague, our trade critic, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy).

When you ask Canadians, as many polls have attempted to do over the course of the last few months, about whether you