

here to talk about solutions and this government has come up with absolutely nothing.

The same old Tories were around in the last depression when we heard that famous expression by their American counterpart, the then President of the United States, Hoover, who said: "Root hog or die—Root hog or die". Free enterprise for the poor. Free enterprise for the middle class, but socialism for the rich.

Let us take a look at the banks in this country. The banks are protected by a form of marketing board, the very thing they want to destroy for the farmers. The Bank of Canada, in effect, is a form of marketing board; money supply, money control for the five private major banks in this country, a public instrument to protect those private banks that are now making higher profits than any other corporate sector in this country and being protected by this government; \$4 billion last year of profits made by the banks—\$4 billion that the super rich in this country are guaranteed protection on, yet the poor, the unemployed have no succour from this government.

An hon. member: They are paying taxes.

Mr. Barrett: Oh, they are paying tax. Let us hear it for the crying. If the banks paid taxes at the same rate that a bank clerk pays, we would all be a heck of a lot better off. Bank clerks pay more percentage than the bank itself does. Do not give me the stuff that banks are paying their fair share of taxes. The banks are protected by this government and a socialist instrument known as the Bank of Canada.

The insurance companies in this country are fat, loaded and doing well. To extend it further, we see that even a separate bank is going to be favoured by the North American free trade agreement with Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I refer you to a report, not in Canada but in the United States. In Canada, unlike Mexico, unlike the United States, the parliamentarians of this country have yet to have a briefing on the draft bracketed agreement on the Canada-U.S.-Mexico deal. The Mexican senators have had a briefing, the U.S. Congress people have had a briefing, but nothing here in Canada. Keep us in the dark no matter what you are planning to sign.

Government Orders

I quote from *The Financial Post* of just this morning. *The Financial Post* is not a supporter of the New Democratic Party. If it were, I would not buy it. This is what *The Financial Post* stated this morning, and I quote: "Washington—Canada will be the only nation to suffer under a North American free trade agreement according to a bleak study released yesterday".

An hon. member: By who?

Mr. Barrett: Wait, I am coming to that. Do not get nervous. I know his anxiety level is rising. I know the tension is overwhelming him, but I tell him, do not get nervous. I am in order.

"While Mexico gains 600,000 jobs, the U.S. gains 130,000 jobs, Canada stands to lose 5,000 jobs" says the Institute for International Economics, as it produced the gloomiest predictions for Canada of any serious scrutiny done of the contentious free trade debate. I emphasize any serious scrutiny because this government has produced absolutely no documents on its position in the negotiating of that agreement to this House. It was Southam News which, through the Freedom of information act, got access to the documents it had prepared for its own side of briefings for the Canadian position. The documents released under the information act, forced by Southam News, indicated the very same thing, that this government was going into a mine field on the Mexican negotiations. Let us understand very, very openly and obviously that this government is on a course of another sell-out just as the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement has been.

I do not intend to be negative for my full 20 minutes. I have some positive alternatives to help this government out of its mess. It is necessary to understand how stupid, how foolish and how closeted this government has been in the dealings on the North American free trade agreement with Mexico. Here is an American study by a reputable organization that has shown clearly exactly what the government's own private briefings had.

Do not run out, Mr. Member, I am not through yet. Furthermore, this study goes on to show in stark contrast the U.S. \$2 billion trade deficit it had with Mexico in 1990 would undergo a positive swing of \$9 billion by 1995. Another slap against Canada will be redirection of U.S. imports from Canadian sources to Mexican sources. Why not? If under the free trade agreement with Canada and the United States the United States is forced to buy a Canadian product because of that agreement and we then go in with Mexico, it will obviously buy a similar Mexican product. Why would it not? Any dumb-bell can