

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

to affect the continuation of existing or the establishment of new Canadian social programs? Is that not precisely what the Prime Minister stated the deal was all about and that those things were not threatened?

*[Translation]*

If the Agreement does not call into question our sovereign right to create new social programs to respond to the needs of our growing number of senior citizens, for example, or to set up a universal day care program, if that is our decision, nothing prevents us from saying so clearly in the Agreement.

*[English]*

The Prime Minister assured Canadians that our ability to legislate and implement environmental protection is not threatened by this deal. If indeed that is the agreement with the Americans, amendments to make it absolutely explicit should be no problem. However, the Government refused to allow us to introduce the "dangerous" amendment that nothing in the agreement applies to existing or future programs and policies to protect the environment, reduce pollution, or conserve the land, resources, and water of Canada. Now, is that not a dangerous amendment? We could not bear to have it see the light of day in the House it is so dangerous to the trade agreement.

The Prime Minister assured Canadians that regional development programs were not in jeopardy in the negotiations to come. Yet we find in the agreement that only two specific regional development programs are exempted from being considered unfair subsidies and therefore countervailable.

We are concerned about all the regional development programs. That is why we put forward a amendment that stated that nothing in this agreement would prevent the authority of Canada in any of the following areas, and I will mention only one, economic development of all regions of Canada on an equitable basis. What is the problem with that amendment, if that indeed is what the agreement allows?

The Prime Minister assured Canadians that there will be ample adjustment and retraining programs to cushion the negative effects of employment dislocation. Yet, the Government refused and prevented amendments coming to the floor of the House that would have ensured that no interpretation in the future would minimize that power of the Government.

There were other amendments to clarify the protection of our water resources and our control of water.

There were amendments to allow monitoring in order that we could put in place those adjustment programs. There were amendments specifying the sovereignty of Canada. In all those areas they were amendments not to change the agreement, but simply to put in writing what the Prime Minister said.

I shall vote against this Bill because I believe it to be fundamentally flawed on three major points. First, it does not secure free trade, it does not secure assured access to the American market, it does not secure exemptions from protectionist American trade laws, and it does not secure a binding dispute settlement mechanism. Second, there is no conclusion in this agreement on what is a subsidy. Future considerations may be an all right term in hockey contracts. It is not an all right term when the stakes are your country. Third, this is not a free trade deal when it gives away the strongest bargaining tools we have to go into those five to seven years of negotiation. What else do we have to trade with? What else do we have to negotiate? We have given up control of access and pricing of our energy, investment in Canada, and control of our financial institutions.

As I read this deal and talked about it through the campaign, I kept thinking about Kenny Rogers. I wished that he had been standing at Simon Reisman's elbow or at the Prime Minister's elbow as he signed this agreement. He said: "You got to know when to hold, and you got to know when to fold up, know when to walk away, and know when to stay". Mr. Reisman knew when to walk away, and the Prime Minister sent him back to sell a little bit more of the country.

I believe that the sell-out of investment is particularly damaging, and it puts small businesses in this country on the auction block, and not necessarily to the highest bidder. I believe that investing in Canada with its rich resources and vast potential is a privilege, a privilege that should bring with it economic opportunities, not ownership of Canadians.

The riding I represent is touched by all these issues. It is diverse and represents the full richness of urban living in Canada. I represent very wealthy Canadians, middle-income Canadians, low-income working families struggling to make ends meet, and thousands who live below the poverty line. Many are single parents raising their children on public assistance. I know the inadequacy of the present social and training programs to meet the needs of these families to raise their children and to live with dignity and hope for the future.