

Government Orders

Canada and then we Canadians will benefit from some kind of fall down there.

That is absolutely nonsense. If these people were Canadians and they had one iota of concern for Canada they would begin to turn this thing around and stop the cancerous growth of foreign ownership in this country.

I find the minister's presentation to this House absolutely offensive that we could afford even further sell-outs to the Americans. It is absolutely wrong and they are going to get crucified on this issue.

I congratulate my colleague for the amendments he has put forward and the critical issues he has addressed in these amendments. One is the protection of Canadian employment, which the minister and the Conservative government just dismiss as an irrelevant issue, turn over as a casualty to market forces, privatization, deregulation and the trade agreements. "Oh well, we can have jobless recovery because we will have a recovery. We can get rid of Canadian jobs." He said that in the House. It is absolutely disgusting.

The unfortunate thing is that we are looking at a situation where this attitude of the Conservative government is to sell this country to the United States through the Canada-U.S. trade agreement and the North American free trade agreement, the whole strategy behind privatization and deregulation is simply to create an environment where there can be an economic union with the United States, where Canada becomes a Puerto Rico, where American companies are the dominant forces in transportation, communication, manufacturing and delivery of services.

It is unfortunate that we do not have a clear statement from the other opposition party in this House that it would reverse it and not follow the trends of the previous Liberal government of continuing the expansion of foreign control of Canada, but that it would get rid of those trade agreements, not implement them in spite of what has happened in this House with the Conservative government, that it would reverse the role

of privatization and deregulation which has seriously harmed Canada.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting section and probably the key to where the telecommunications architecture will take us in the years to come.

This section is called: "The Canadian Telecommunications Policy: The Objective Section". It is of interest to note they affirm: "That telecommunications performs an essential role in the maintenance of Canada's identity and sovereignty. The Canadian telecommunications policy has as its objectives to facilitate the orderly development throughout Canada of a telecommunication system that serves to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the social and economic fabric of Canada and its regions".

What is interesting about this, along with the other nine aspects of this particular bill, (a) to (i), is it sends the message for this whole structure.

The minister and the Crown forgot to address the whole question of convergence on technology and the whole question of telephony in its broadest aspects. The minister made it very clear when he stood up in this House a moment ago, even though in committee on many occasions he felt that there was a phoney issue being floated and he said so in committee.

Anyone who wants to know about it can read the proceedings and find out about the whole question of encroachment on any one of our provincial jurisdictions. The minister explained that he believes culture is subsumed by sovereignty and identity and therefore keeping culture in the bill is redundant.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I enjoy listening to the hon. member and she will have seven minutes left in the debate when it comes back into the Chamber.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 30(6), the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.