

that amendments be accepted so that when the deal goes through, it will be a deal with which Canadians can feel confident.

Last, I would like to remind the Government of the need to address the needs of the North and to ensure that the people of the North can compete on an equal basis. That means the provision of the necessary infrastructure, the water and sewer, roads and communication facilities that are needed to allow the people of the North to compete.

● (1710)

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the House, it gives me a great deal of pride to represent the new constituency of Saskatoon—Dundurn. Those who are familiar with Saskatchewan will realize the two previous seats, Saskatoon East and Saskatoon West were divided by the river. Saskatoon—Dundurn has the beautiful South Saskatchewan River flowing through it and a great diversity within the constituency ranging from farmlands to beautiful residential areas. As well we have a certain amount of industry from potash mines to packing houses.

I would like to thank the voters of Saskatoon—Dundurn. It gives me a great deal of pride to be here on their behalf. I believe the main reason I am here, although it is not the only one, is that the feeling against free trade in that part of Saskatchewan was so strong that people knew there was no one other than the New Democrats who would be able to stand up for their rights in this staid and beautiful place that we call the Parliament of Canada.

Speaking of the Parliament of Canada, it gives me a great honour to stand here as a Member of the New Democratic Party having been represented in the past by such illustrious people as J. S. Woodsworth, M. J. Coldwell, Tommy Douglas and many others who I should probably mention but am unable to because of time restrictions. One of the reasons we are here today, and speaking most vociferously as we are, is as a result of the legacy of the people whom I have just mentioned. There is no doubt whatever that Canada is an entirely different kind of nation than that of the United States.

Because of that Canada represents a threat to the U.S.A. That is one of the main reasons that we have got ourselves into this free trade deal with the Americans. We talk about harmonizing, level playing fields and social programs. But, this nation of ours is a better nation than that south of the border. I did not say it was

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

stronger or more militaristic, I simply said it was a better place and a better society in which to live. The free trade deal covers every aspect of Canadian society, and I would suggest that from the point of view of the opposition to it, in its entirety. If the free trade deal were a human being, you would have to say of it that it has no redeeming social values. We have to ask ourselves some questions about the free trade deal.

We have to ask why on earth we have it in the first place. We have to ask ourselves what effects it will have on our earning capacity and we have to ask ourselves among other things the effects it will have on agriculture. I think also we should ask ourselves what will life be like after free trade.

Why are we in this free trade deal? We can answer in relation to the United States and mostly in relation to the U.S. as we see the American society since the 1980s and the election of President Reagan. We have come back to something we have almost forgotten and that is Reaganomics and monetarism, the theory of doing business that says if you leave business alone, if you leave industry alone, if you deregulate and let industries run on their own, they will prosper beyond all imaginable levels. I suppose their people will be driving Mercedes Benz, as was alluded to earlier. If that were the case, if the society we are trying so hard to emulate had arrived at that level, I would suggest that everyone in the United States should probably be driving Mercedes Benz.

An Hon. Member: Do you have a bicycle?

Mr. Fisher: The United States of America has since the 1980s used a hands-off approach. The whole concept of monetarism has got itself into the mess in which it is now.

Only a moment ago a Member opposite referred to a \$170 billion deficit which the United States has and he suggested that was big trouble. I suggest \$170 billion is certainly big trouble. Reaganomics is demonstrably at the root of that said trouble.

Once the effects of Reaganomics took full force and the regulation of business became the leading aspect of the day, all kinds of very strange things happened in the U.S. We have for all intents and purposes what amounted to dumping, dumping from countries where wages were very low, of commodities ranging from steel to automobiles to any number of other commodities. These things flowed into the United States—some legal, some illegal. Some found their way into the U.S. through