

Extension of Sittings

When I look at this trade deal, irrespective of political affiliation, I am saddened as a Canadian that we have allowed the United States to get us into a deal that looks to me very much like a one-way street.

In terms of our energy resources, as precious as those resources are, we will now be treating the United States of America as if it were Canadian. We cannot sell oil to the United States at a higher price than we can sell it to Nova Scotia or to another province. To me that belittles and undermines the very sovereign fact of any nation. Show me any nation on the face of this globe that sells its energy resources, its bank account, at a lower or the same domestic price, and you will be showing me a precedent in world history. Yet we have allowed ourselves to enter that kind of agreement.

There is a great deal of concern in this country with respect to financial institutions because once again we are going down a one-way street. The American business interests can come into this country and buy our banks and our trust companies, but because American banks and trust companies are controlled state by state, we cannot do that.

If one wants to get into an exchange and allow a country to buy into another's financial institutions, fine. I happen to disagree, but if that is the *raison d'être*, fine. But to allow one side to do it and not the other, when talking about financial institutions, what kind of leadership does that suggest? What kind of leadership does it suggest to the country? How can we engender a sense of confidence and maturity and national building with this kind of deal?

Yesterday our Leader, in a very moving, passionate and articulate statement of fact, set the individual substance for this debate in the proper perspective, that is, that we have the firm belief, not of arrogance but a deep moving, gut feeling, that we are on the right side of history. We feel that the majority of Canadians, as witnessed by the popular vote, share that feeling. As we begin to see people displaced in the factories and plants in our own backyard, that feeling will swell. It will not provide any pleasure for us to say: "We told you so". It will cause a certain anguish that the Government did not hear the calls and concerns.

We are looking forward to entering into the debate on substance. We are looking forward to monitoring the trade deal. We have every confidence that Canadians will join in our struggle, and our movement, and will stand up for the country that we not only have built and

love, but a country we wish to pass on to future generations.

This forum is important. It is for that reason we are not going to let go of a debate that wishes to do away with the rules and our democratic right to speak our mind as an elected representative. We will not allow that flame to die easily.

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate today on the hijacking of Parliament by the Conservative Government. It is regrettable that we have to participate in this debate today, but I look forward to further discussions as we talk about the trade legislation that this Government has brought forward.

At the outset, I would like to congratulate the Speaker on his election to the chair.

• (1610)

However, it is regrettable that in our enthusiasm last week over his election we are now dealing with the situation of a ham-fisted Government. I also want to pay credit to my leader who spoke last night about the concerns we have over this current trade legislation. He raised our concerns over the softwood lumber tariff, shakes and shingles, which are critical to my riding of Prince George—Bulkley Valley in my Province of British Columbia. He also spoke of the concerns we have over the environment and social programs and, frankly, our view of this country.

We are talking today about a procedural motion. We are talking about the abandonment of the Standing Orders of this House. These are the rules that govern this House and give us our guidance in our proceedings when we consider legislation, motions and other issues.

Now the Tory Government has hijacked the rules of Parliament. We are used to that under the Tories. In fact, I took the opportunity before our debate today to do a little research. Let us see just where the Tories stand in history. The *Collins Dictionary* states that Conservatives were outlaws who preyed upon English settlers. The *Encyclopaedia of Parliament* says about the Conservatives: "The word originally applied to Irish bandits". The Conservatives are preying upon Parliament and the Members opposite are bandits who have stolen the rules of Parliament.

What will they do next? The Members opposite are certainly repeat offenders and should be placed on probation, like the notion we are giving them now.