

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

**Mr. Hockin:** On the Member's collectivist notions, can he name one Crown corporation that is disadvantaged by the free trade agreement? Crown corporations are the NDP's great example of collectivist thought. Can the Member even point to one Crown corporation that is disadvantaged in any real way by the free trade agreement? In fact, if the Hon. Member took a look at the uranium agreement, he would find there is improved access for our Crown corporations into the United States.

The second question is on protecting the state and protecting our ability as a country to forward our national interests. Has the Member read Article 906 of the free trade agreement which says that the parties to this agreement have agreed to allow existing or future incentives for oil and gas exploration, development and related activities in order to maintain the reserve base for these energy resources? Has he read that this is an energy policy? That is the heart of an energy policy. That is the state acting to protect the leverage of a country when it comes to major decisions on energy. Has the Hon. Member read that? How does the Hon. Member square that with what he said?

Third, talking about red Tories, does the Hon. Member not agree that the great problems in the African countries is that they have not developed enough resources to produce the kind of cultural and social programs they would like? It is through wealth and wealth creation that one builds one's culture, builds a reading public and a public for cultural productions and funds the social service programs. If you secure access to the largest market in the world, is it not true for anybody interested cosmologically in red Toryism that there is much more there in terms of resources for future generations as well as present generations culturally, in social services and in every other sense?

● (2050)

The fourth and final question and the most important one is this. Does he not agree, when he looks at this agreement, that we have put ourselves in a position where we have multiplied our leverage with the U.S. ten times with respect to bilateral disputes? For example, on trade remedies we have essentially negotiated equality with the U.S. With respect to sideswiping, when they get annoyed with another foreign country and apply a trade remedy to them, Canada will be exempted. Canada, one-tenth the size of the United States, has gained resources through this agreement, increased its sovereignty, its dignity, and that is what a red Tory or any kind of Tory would believe. In fact, a socialist should believe that as well.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, obviously—

**An Hon. Member:** Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Madam Speaker, it is not because I look at you that I say that; it is because I am not looking at you when I say that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** I do wish the Hon. Member would look at me when he addresses me.

**Mr. Blaikie:** The argument arose as to what constitutes a red Tory because I brought it up with respect to the various political and philosophical traditions that make up the Canadian mix which is set to be destroyed by this agreement. I suppose one of the people that comes quickly to my mind is George Grant who in 1963, wrote a book called *Lament for a Nation* in which he lamented the increasing absorption of Canada into what he called the advanced technological capitalism of the U.S. What we have here is the completion, I believe, of the process that he began to lament in 1963 with the defeat of the Diefenbaker Government over its refusal to do the bidding of the U.S. That was his analysis.

**Mr. Hockin:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Blaikie:** That was his analysis and I suppose he would be recognized by almost everyone as a red Tory whether they agree with him or not. That is the kind of analysis I was referring to.

The Hon. Minister also asked me to name Crown corporations which might be damaged by the agreement. The fact is that Crown corporations are on the hit list of the Progressive Conservative Government. It sees the elimination of Crown corporations as part and parcel of its whole economic agenda. Free trade, deregulation and privatization are the three thrusts of Tory economic policy.

The Minister asked me what Crown corporations might be damaged by the free trade agreement, as if he cared about Crown corporations. The fact is that he does not or else he would not be privatizing them. The Government would not be trying to sell Air Canada. It would not have the Hon. Member for Lethbridge—Foothills (Mr. Thacker) talking about selling the CNR as he did, not too long ago. It would not have the policies it has with respect to privatization. The Minister mentioned the uranium industry. The Government has already sold off that industry. I do not know how we can damage a Crown corporation that we do not have any more as a result of the privatization policy. It is sheer hypocrisy for these people to get up and pretend they care about Crown corporations.

**Mr. McDermid:** You did not answer the question.

**Mr. Blaikie:** I did so. The Minister quoted to me elements of the agreement having to do with energy policy. The key words were "existing policies". We know what the existing policy of the Government is. It is a deregulated energy sector. Of course in a free trade agreement you could agree to preserve existing policies.

**Mr. McDermid:** And future policies.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Preserve existing non-policies with respect to regulation of the energy sector.