

**CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE
AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Crosbie that Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States of America, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee; and the amendments of Mr. Axworthy (p. 16661) and of Mr. Young (p. 17089).

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Madam Speaker, I should not have thought it possible that over a century of struggle of this nation to maintain its independence would end with the fulfilment of the American notion of a manifest destiny within the House of Commons of Canada.

I talk as one who loves his country and not as one who is anti-American. As a matter of fact, my colleague to my right and I participated over the last three weeks in a joint celebration between the Cities of Detroit and Windsor celebrating our friendship, celebrating our mutual independence, and honouring our differences. Those who would allege that those of us opposed to this particular deal are anti-American ought to recognize that from where I come we have cousins, uncles, sisters, and brothers on the other side of the river. We marry and have children that are often American, as my children are. My wife is American. Let us not engage in allegations that because we stand for the preservation of a Canada that we love that we are anti-American.

Canada is a rich and a wonderful country, richly endowed with many natural resources becoming increasingly a nation that reflects the many peoples of the world. It is a country that perhaps can be described as one of the most civilized, if not the most civilized of the world, because it pursues not just the prosperity and the enrichment of the few but has a total commitment to social justice that marks us as different from many other nations of the western world. But because we are civilized and richly endowed does not mean that we have done all that we could have done.

Historically the many natural resources that we have had have been traded off to Europe, to Great Britain, to our neighbour to the south, and to Japan. We have done so with fair rewards and a fair degree of comfort, but those resources were traded off at the cost of jobs that might have been created in Canada if we had appropriately exploited the comparative advantages of our rich endowment of natural resources, including energy. It is historically true that those who in the past were willing to enrich themselves grandly by sacrificing jobs that might have been created to enrich a small portion of the population of the past, constitute the same sector of our society that would now perpetuate Canada as a resource source for our neighbours to the south.

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

● (2120)

Canada must now face a world that has changed tremendously, a world in which we understand that Canada must be much more open than it has been in the past, in order to compete effectively in a free trade environment.

Let me dismiss another allegation that is addressed to us who are opposed to this deal, who are opposed to free trade, that we are afraid of competing. It has been said by those who advocate this deal that there are going to be certain losses, certain sacrifices, in order to achieve long-term gain.

I would say that if the Canadian people are to suffer losses in order to achieve long-term gain, then let it be at the price of the sacrifice that must be made to maintain our independence, and not to give away a country that is a rising star to a nation that is a falling star. There is no doubt that critical changes must take place. Surely those changes should not be constituted in giving away the comparative advantage which our resources present us. They should not be on the basis of conceding our energy resources that could give us the ability to compete in a variety of areas with the rest of the world. They should not be at the expense of giving away our industry to those in the south. They should not be at the cost of allowing the acquisition of our businesses and our industries without being able to impose even those minimal and nevertheless yet costly conditions that we were able to apply when we entered into the Auto Pact.

We have heard a lot of talk about the Auto Pact. I do not want to enter into a long discussion about the Auto Pact in particular, but there is one thing that characterizes this deal clearly, namely, benefits. I would say that the Auto Pact was flawed, but nevertheless the benefits which it provided in terms of an assured level of production in Canada and jobs therefor have been excluded by this deal.

What other nation would give away its comparative advantages? What other nation would give away over the long run control over its financial institutions? One would have to be a pretty crude idiot not to understand that those who ultimately control the financial institutions of the country determine where investment will take place.

What kind of a country would state what no other countries in the world have done, because they recognize the neo-colonial aspect of it, that our service industries will be open to Americans on an equal basis with Canadians?

We understand that the elements of information and so on constitute the mode of control of nations. Even Third World countries understand that concessions with respect to the service industries are concessions with respect to ultimate sovereignty.

The future of this country does not reside in becoming part of the continental divine mission of the United States. Our future must reside in Canada driving a hole in its future, taking its competitive advantages, its cheap energy and its resources and building from them the industries that will