

**Mr. McDermid:** We have it in our Customs Act.

**Mr. McCurdy:** But why not in the legislation itself? That is not a sufficient argument to reject this amendment and to waste the time of the House in this fashion. One has to become just a little suspicious of all this haranguing, this pettiness, this meanness, and this intellectual dishonesty over a trivial amendment which, as the Parliamentary Secretary says, would change not a thing. One must get suspicious. Is it that there is a danger that providing a definition of Canada might somehow offend the Americans? Certainly this deal has been contrived in most ways not to offend the Americans.

This definition is not really what is at issue here. The definition suggested in the amendment comes essentially from the agreement which says: "—Canada, the territory to which its customs laws apply, including any areas beyond the territorial seas of Canada within which, in accordance with international law and its domestic laws, Canada may exercise rights with respect to the seabed and subsoil and their natural resources—".

This definition of Canada is not what is at issue here. There is a definition of Canada which, it seems to me, we ought to attend. Even this territorial definition draws attention to the fact that this agreement is an attack on the very definition of Canada as the people of this country understand. At issue here is not this customs definition of Canada but a definition of Canada as the most civilized, humane, and generous country in the world, a country that is not devoted to the market forces as the motivator of what we are and what we shall be but a country that recognizes that social justice is the very meat of our existence.

Nobody ever said that violence in Canada is as Canadian as maple sugar. We are a different country. We have vast resources that this deal would sell off. We have the highest percentage of foreign ownership which we would expand. We have considerable comparable advantages which we could exploit, but by this deal will not be able to. We are a country that can mobilize its financial resources to build a new future but we give even the control of our financial resources away.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would love to listen to the Hon. Member but his time has expired.

● (1910)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The question is on Motion No. 1 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In my opinion, the nays have it.

*And more than five Members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next grouping is on Motions Nos. 5, 6 and 8.

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry)** moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 3.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-130 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the 10 minutes which we are allowed at report stage is not sufficient time to do justice to these very important amendments on critical clauses of the Bill. I will use the 10 minutes to make two very crucial points.

The first concerns the stated purpose of the Bill.

The purpose we see in the legislation and the reason we are asking for its deletion has nothing to do with the Bill itself. The purpose outlined in Bill C-130 is not the reason why the Bill was introduced or why the trade agreement was started, and certainly has nothing to do with the kind of legislation before us.

This afternoon, the Member from Calgary said that this got started with a royal commission. Of course, that is not true. When one looks at the record, the proposal for the free trade agreement began in 1983 with some private meetings with the Ambassador from the United States in Ottawa, Mr. Robinson, and key members of the business community. They began to discuss why Canada should no longer be allowed to introduce such things as a National Energy Program or provide for policies that would conserve our own resources for our own purposes.

The real purpose of this Bill has very little to do with trade and is much more concerned with the economic agenda of the coalition of neo-conservative forces in this country who do not like the idea that Government itself can be a constructive contributor to making policies on behalf of Canadians.

What we are debating is the agenda of the republican party of the north. We are seeing the swan song of President Reagan