

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 13, 1992

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

#### SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—TRADE

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, Canada should withdraw from the negotiations concerning a North American free trade agreement, give notice of withdrawal from the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, and pursue a global trade strategy not based on making the planet an unfettered playground for the multinational corporate elite.

He said: Madam Speaker, come the next election Canadians will have to make a choice about the future of their country. That choice will be a choice between electing a political party like the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada or the Reform Party of Canada—

• (1010)

**An hon. member:** Same thing.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Same thing, someone says, incorrectly—that is committed to the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and the idea of a North American free trade agreement, now being negotiated between Canada, the U.S. and Mexico; or electing a political party that believes that these two agreements, one actual and one potential, ever imminent as we understand, to be so anti-ethical to the survival of Canada that we must get out of one and avoid ever getting into the other.

This is the choice that must be put to the Canadian people at the time of the next election, and it is the New

Democratic Party of Canada, and only the New Democratic Party of Canada, that will make that choice a possibility for Canadians in 1992 or 1993, whenever the next election comes.

It will be our duty to do so, both in faithfulness to our own principles and in faithfulness to Canada. Canadians will have to choose between a future dictated by these agreements, a future which will involve one set of problems, or a future free to seek a real and qualitatively different alternative to such agreements, a future which will also have its own set of problems.

In a world that is characterized by the so-called globalization trend that the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and the North American free trade agreement are both symptoms of and responses to, the choice is whether to resist this trend or to accommodate it or, even more accurately, when it comes to the current government, to be a promoter of it.

Accommodation or resistance, these are the choices. The accommodationist says, of globalization and its other buzzword “competitiveness”, that we really have no option. The accommodationists suggest that those who run the world are increasingly designing a world in which this is the stark reality and that the sooner we get on the bandwagon and redesign ourselves to fit this new world, the better. To accommodationists this is the counsel of reality. To those who would resist, it is of course the counsel of despair.

The accommodationist either believes or wants others to believe in any case, that globalization is something like the weather, that we cannot do anything about it, that the emerging global marketplace is not a human creation answerable to some account of what it does for or to humanity, but a force unto itself to which the wise would do well to submit. To do otherwise is folly, would say the accommodationists.

The resister says of globalization and competition that a planet controlled by global market forces only is not