protected in that any new owner will be required to honour existing labour agreements and pension benefits.

NorthwesTel ought to be sold to private investors and certainly not to a provincial Crown corporation. It would be improper for Alberta Government Telephones, for example, to own and operate a telephone system outside the Province of Alberta.

If privatization is handled correctly, it could result in improved service and lower prices to telephone users in both the Northwest Territories and Yukon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST FOR PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I have been expressing concern for months that the Government would attempt to ram the final text of the Prime Minister's trade deal between Canada and the United States through Parliament without giving the Canadian people the proper time to review, investigate, and study the deal, and without giving the House a proper opportunity to debate it. The Prime Minister has always told me that this would not be the case. He knows that the House will apparently adjourn in four days and that, some time in the next four days, he wants the House to debate the issue in a meaningful way. This is an issue that is fundamental to the style of Canada in which many of us believe, and is certainly fundamental to Canada's future.

Will the Prime Minister give me an assurance today, and I believe that his credibility and his word are on the line, that he is prepared to tell the people of Canada that there will be time for a full public review of this deal through committee hearings and a full, meaningful debate in the House of Commons before he signs the deal?

• (1420)

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, if the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition is patient I am sure that he will see, on the Order Paper tomorrow morning, a resolution which will allow Parliament to debate this very important issue. I hope we will have the support of the Opposition in bringing the debate forward tomorrow in order that we can have a good debate this week.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver—Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping for a reaffirmation of the commitment of the Prime Minister that he would allow the people of this country sufficient opportunity to review the text and examine how it affects their futures, their jobs, their professions, and their businesses, and allow the House of Commons sufficient time to review the matter properly.

[*Translation*]

CONTROL OF RESOURCES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): The Prime Minister claimed on the weekend that people already had a good understanding of this matter. Well, I would like to know what his understanding is of the instruments of this Agreement. Could the Prime Minister explain why, under Sections 408, 409, 903, 904, Canada's provinces are deprived of their jurisdiction over their own energy resources? Can he explain why we, as Canadians, can no longer cut energy exports to the United States if there is a shortage or other crisis? And can he explain why these rules not only apply to energy but to all our nonrenewable resources, including water?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has made some very serious factual errors. There is nothing in the document that would deprive the provinces of their jurisdiction in the energy sector. There is nothing in the document that would undermine the provincial or federal governments' authority to reduce energy exports. In fact, these provisions are to become effective pursuant to an international agreement signed thirteen years ago by the previous Government. The Leader of the Opposition has raised a number of points. I may draw his attention to the fact that his points were dealt with very satisfactorily this morning in the newspaper *Le Devoir*, where the reference is to an historic challenge, and the conclusion "that the Government was right and that this will increasingly be borne out by events. *Le Devoir*, like most Quebecers, endorses the Free Trade Agreement as being in the best interests of Quebecers and Canadians.

[*English*]

EFFECT ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): With respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Prime Minister has read the deal he intends to sign. He talks about the international energy agreement which applies to stocks. This agreement applies to all resources, renewable and non-renewable, not only processed but in the ground. It is the most far-reaching agreement any country has ever signed. We have really made ourselves a resource reservoir for the United States by virtue of this agreement.

The Prime Minister has repeatedly promised the country that regional development would not be covered by this agreement. Yet nowhere in the text is there a specific exemption in favour of regional development. Indeed, precisely the opposite has happened.

I want to refer the Prime Minister to page 115 of his deal where it says that the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, PFRA; the Agriculture and Rural Development Act, ARDA; and the Economic and Rural Development Agreements, ERDA; are defined as subsidies within the meaning of the agreement.