

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

We believe in selling resources on a trade basis. We have lumber to sell, although we have to put an export tax on it. That is another cave-in the Government agreed to. That one almost slipped my mind. Why can we not do this on a trade basis? We will process resources to their highest limit and then sell them at an agreed on price. However, under this deal, we do not agree to sell electricity to New York at New York prices. We agree to sell electricity to New York at the Canadian price. It is an incredible arrangement.

I hope there will be an election so that we can talk to the Canadian people. There has been no opportunity for public hearings. I had the opportunity to go across the country for five days and to visit five provinces last December before the deal was signed, and I do not think Canadians will buy it. As a matter of fact, the most recent Environics poll showed that some 40 per cent were opposed to it and only 38 per cent in favour. Of those who are in favour of it, only 8 per cent or 10 per cent are strongly in favour of it, whereas those who are opposed are strongly opposed to it because it is a bad deal.

I do not think anyone in the House is opposed to reducing tariffs. That has been happening for the last 40 years. That is what will happen during the Uruguay Round in Geneva or through other arrangements. It is the giving away of resources and of control over foreign investment that is so repulsive about this deal.

Clause 6 provides the hammer that will make sure that provincial Governments comply with the deal and with the federal Government's wishes, whether they want to or not. That is why we propose to eliminate it.

**Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, these amendments go to the heart of what this agreement is all about. These amendments, if passed, would give us some control over what will happen in the future.

National treatment and its implications could be the real sleeper in this agreement. If we read the agreement carefully, we will recognize that it has gone further than the European Common Market has been able to go in the past 28 years. From now on, Canadians will have to treat Americans the same way they treat each other, and vice versa. In many ways, that can be a positive thing and I would like to take a moment to see what is positive about it and what is negative about it.

It is good to attempt to treat each other in the same way we would like to be treated, but I do not think it is good that another country would force its value system on us. That is where my concerns lie.

For many years, we have made major investments to attempt to focus on an east-west country. Certainly most of our population resides in a strip along the southern part of Canada. We have worked against natural forces to develop our trade and our two founding cultures. We have struggled hard in a geographically northern society to make a country that I would like to think we are all proud of.

If we limit our ability to have provincial and national economic strategies, as this agreement does, we would weaken our ability to strengthen ourselves from the East to the West. I have been involved in economic development committees over the years that have looked at increasing Canadian content with conditions we felt were good for the communities in which we were working. We did this with some success right across Canada. This Bill is now giving the federal Government the power to override many of the things the provinces would choose to do, things that the provinces, with their knowledge of their own communities, will not be able to do any longer. I think that is a real tragedy.

Going into the 21st century, we should not attempt to do things individually. I do not think that Government, labour or business should attempt to go it alone. We need to have a collective of co-operation if we really want to strengthen the economy and the future of Canada.

I do not think we have done a particularly good job in economic planning, but more and more, as we have matured, we have recognized that there are certain things we do well on which we want to build and there are certain skills we want to develop. As the Hon. Member who spoke previously said, we have these riches which are God-given riches. We have done nothing to obtain them, they happen to be part of the country in which we live. We should use those resources with respect to ecology and without using them as a trading element. Our resources are not things another country can help itself to.

Something many people have not said in the debate on the trade agreement is that the stronger we become as a country, the stronger our friendship with the United States will be. The resentments will not grow. With Clause 8, we will be able to pass laws that will tell the provinces what they cannot do if it is not in concert with the trade agreement with the United States. What you do is build up an awful lot of resentment.

● (2010)

A lot of people feel if only they had some power to take control over their own economy, their own future, they would be able to do things differently. This is not necessarily always right. Sometimes it is perception rather than reality. However, as soon as you take from people the ability to make their own decisions, then their creativity and productivity, all those things that bring people together to make for a strong community, are diminished. I have not heard people discussing that but it is very real.

We have heard about the polarization of the East and West and the centre of Canada. If you want to see polarization in the future, get this agreement on its way. I think some of the Premiers are swallowing hard as they say we have to do this to get the agreement. It seems to me that agreements made on these terms are not good agreements. If we want a good agreement, it has to be discussed, not rushed through. We need to have a sense of confidence in our nationhood, where we are