

Let us not pretend that it is only the Tories who are interested in the accountability of Crown corporations.

What, then, is the NDP's view on this, Mr. Speaker? The Hon. Member for Vegreville has initiated an ideological argument and I am going to give him that kind of answer. We are interested in both equality and community. We believe that both these concepts are central to our vision of the way things ought to be. Equality and community have to go together. This connection between the two is found in the name of the NDP's predecessor, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, which through the idea of a commonwealth went far beyond the notion of mere income redistribution, which so often passes for left-leaning, social economic policies these days, particularly on the other side of the House.

In the vision of the Co-operative Commonwealth Party equality would not only be possible but it would be cherished. People presumably would abandon the dehumanizing and undignified motives that economic competitiveness creates. In place of the law of the jungle which the Conservatives advocate we would have a truly civilized society based on co-operation with each and every person, according to their God-given endowment, making his or her creative contribution to the betterment of the human community and each, in turn, receiving what he or she needs out of the abundance created by that very same co-operative endeavour. It would be the brotherhood and sisterhood of the human family instead of the cut-throat individualism or the exploitive monopoly which is characteristic of capitalism these days.

In so far as cut-throat individualism has prevailed, we have seen an increasing breakdown of social purpose and sense of community, the very things the Conservatives lament. Indeed, if we are all just isolated individuals in the marketplace looking after number one, what sense does it make to use words like "social" or "community", the very concept against which this motion is directed? Socialization has everything to do with community and everything to do with people not just acting as individuals. Yet that is what the Conservatives oppose.

We have an economy which does not recognize such concepts, let alone take heed of them. We are simply to trust that all this organized selfishness will somehow lead to a happy ending.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that I have driven a number of Tory delegates out of the balcony.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cullen: It is lunch time.

Mr. Blaikie: They have walked out in disgust. I can only surmise that I am touching some kind of nerve.

New Democrats know that organized selfishness is not the way to the just society. We all know that the kind of economy which we have and which we want to change is one in which many important human needs are neglected because there is no profit to be made in meeting such needs. Many unnecessary

Supply

and harmful wants are created and encouraged through advertising and what is harmlessly called marketing.

Thus we are not half as surprised as our right-wing opponents that people do not want to do a good day's work any more. Why should they when they have been taught from day one that more for less is the ethic of our society? And when the companies they work for have records a mile long of putting their profit margins ahead of workplace safety and health, ahead of the general environment and ahead of the economic needs of the surrounding community, why should they? If there is to be a genuine, renewed sense of the value and the meaning of work, as there should be, then the renewal would have to be on all sides of the labour-management divide.

We are not half as surprised as our right-wing friends that people do not feel as much responsibility for others as they should and look to government to care for the inconvenient. It is their world view, not ours, which has glorified convenience and self-interest and created an economy in which many families are too geographically separated or too economically weak to look after the old, the disabled, the unemployable or the young.

We agree that a real human community would not have to look to government all the time. We want to set about building that kind of community. We can do it only through a fundamental change in our economy and through leaving many of the values we have learned from capitalism behind us. Instead, we see increasingly smaller groups of people acquiring more and more control over our economy and thus our very lives. This is called free enterprise by the Conservatives.

• (1220)

I refer to some recent mergers, such as Thomson taking over Hudson's Bay or the sweetheart monopolistic arrangements between Thomson and Southam which led to the demise of the *Winnipeg Tribune*. These are only two of many such undesirable incidents in the last few years. These mergers have been unproductive in terms of employment and have contributed to high interest rates. The only merger I could imagine being in favour of would be the one long dreamed of by the left in Canada, the merger and indeed the disappearance of Canadian Pacific into Canadian National Railways, thus socializing once and for all that great Canadian symbol of corporate greed and irresponsible power.

Monopoly means power, and the redistribution of power is what socialization is all about. As I said before, simply to redistribute income without power is not really enough. This is one fault among others of the welfare state. The same people are still in charge, whereas the goal of our movement is not just to see people prosper but also to see people enjoy more responsibility and control over their own lives. The most significant form of monopoly which we find today is that of the multinational corporation or the global corporation, as I prefer to call it. In such corporations we have institutions that are larger and more powerful than many nation states of the world. They blackmail. They play one country against another. They seek the weakest labour and environmental laws they can find.