

Mr. Axworthy: All of a sudden we are now being required, under Clause 6, to ensure compliance. As a result, we break those precedents.

That is why we believe that this is a clause which fundamentally undermines the basic kind of Canadian identity and integrity. When we argue that this is a debate about Canadian independence, Canadian integrity, Canadian rights-to-choose-for-themselves, there is no clearer case of this Government kowtowing, getting on its knees to the sacrifice of this agreement, than Clause 6, because they are prepared to overturn 50 years of precedent, to go against all the sacred precedents that the Prime Minister talked about, that we are going to have better relations with the provinces, that it is going to be cordial conciliation, time and to make this kind of assertion. That is why we think it is wrong.

We do not believe that the federal Government has the right, in legislation such as this, to make that kind of unilateral assertion of new power. If they want to make the case, fine. Go to a federal-provincial meeting, put your case out. Let us have it debated and discussed. Let us see what kind of reaction we get. Let us get an open kind of examination of these requirements. But let us not do it on the basis that simply because the federal Government says so, it is right. That is the full arrogance of the majority, the full arrogance of the abuse of power. It is the reason why we have a federal system, to provide some checks and balances in Canada.

This Government has compromised, appeased, in so many ways, at so many times, in so many essential ingredients of Canada, for the sake of getting this God-forsaken Bill through, it is impossible to count how many times. What it adds up to is once again the kind of fundamental surrender of Canadians' rights of ways of doing things the way we want to do them.

We are allowing ourselves to be taken over, to be guided by a whole new set of principles that may be acceptable to Americans—and that is their business—to make those choices, but they should not be incorporated, insinuated into Canada by this kind of legislation.

When Hon. Members say, "Well, this is just a little trade agreement, commercial arrangement", we point to Clauses 6 and 7. That is not a commercial arrangement. That is a whole new declaration of federal-provincial relations. It has no place in this Bill. If it is going to be done, it should be done in the proper, honourable, respectable, responsible way, and that is to do it in concert, in communion with provinces. That is the Canadian way of doing things, not the republican Party way of doing things. But unfortunately, we have the republican Party of the north in power for a short time. They do not understand the difference.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I want to say first to this House that these are useful amendments which have been put before us, because they permit us to debate what the purpose of this whole exercise actually is. The first motion, Motion No. 5, would attempt to delete the

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

clause in which the purpose of this Bill is outlined. It is exactly the same purpose which is in the free trade agreement itself. It is an outline of purposes which includes within it the falsehoods and statements which take us in a direction which this Government, before its election, never committed itself to, which this Government, in its own legislation, never committed this country to, and yet, these are the purposes for which this Bill is moved, that this agreement is entered into.

The first purpose is an easy one; it is to eliminate barriers to trade and goods and services between Canada and the United States, to get rid of tariffs, non-tariff barriers, if possible. But notice that it deals with services for the first time that any significant trade agreement has dealt with services. Notice, too, that the United States is far and away the most dominant and powerful exporter and monopolizer of the service sector in the world, so much so that in fact within GATT many Third World countries have very strongly resisted the United States push to make services part of the GATT arrangements among trade in the countries. But not us. We do not hesitate, despite a massive deficit with respect to services, despite the fact that the United States does far, far better exporting services to us than we do exporting services to them. We say, "No, open sesame, we are going to provide you free entry to the service sector of our country".

The second purpose is to believe that we are not facilitating conditions of fair competition within the free trade area established by the agreement, fair competition between a country which, on the one side, has committed itself to a social safety net which will protect its people, has committed itself to a broadening of that social safety net, as recently as the announcements made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp), with respect to day care, and yet, on the other side, we have a country where things that we take completely for granted, like medicare, are considered by the present President of the United States to be so out of bounds that they make the advocacy of medicare by Michael Dukakis a danger to the future of the United States.

At the same time, this country with which we are entering into fair competition has dozens of states with right-to-work laws, laws that, under that label, effectively make it almost impossible for trade unions to operate effectively; a country in which it is possible to import goods duty free, from the Maquiladora free trade zone in Mexico in which people receive as wages under a dollar a day, and to have those included as part of the American product which is sold throughout the United States, that is the fair competition which we will face. Minimum wages, far, far lower than the minimum wages that we have here in our country, that is the fair competition that we will face.

● (1930)

It is no wonder that the workers, the companies, the communities in my constituency look at this trade deal and say: "We will be hosed in that kind of unfair competition".