

Committee Reports

● (1210)

Mr. McCurdy: Madam Speaker, first I would like to congratulate my colleague for revealing to the Canadian people one of the elements of the free trade deal which I have not quite noticed being widely publicized in the literature being purchased by the Government to convince Canadians that they should buy this kettle of fish. If this deal is so great and if the provisions set out by my colleague are so much in the interests of Canada, why has the Government not simplified those sections and made sure they are explained across the country? Perhaps the most criminal portion—I do not see any other way of describing it—of the so-called free trade deal is the literal giving away of a competitive advantage in the form of energy to the United States.

An Hon. Member: Nonsense.

Mr. McCurdy: In my view Canada has the potential for a tremendous future based on its ability to develop an economic strategy that would allow economic development in the regions. This provision of the free trade agreement has to be considered contrary to that. I would like to say parenthetically that those in the West and the East who believe that this free trade deal will, through the sale of our energy whether oil or natural gas, lead to the industrialization of the West, had better take a look at American states to see how much they have been industrialized as a result of the American market economy.

I would like to refer to another aspect of energy. I think all Members of this House would have seen *The Journal's* report last week on the greenhouse effect. Over the next three decades Canada could be experiencing fantastic, dramatic, and in some instances tragic, changes in climate as a reflection of climatic changes that will occur around the world. It has been estimated that in southern Ontario we may have an 8° increase in temperature and in the North a 15° increase in temperature. This says to me that, however promising the sale of natural gas and energy is to the United States, the outcome could be fatal for us all either in terms of literally cooking ourselves to death or being engaged in tremendous conflicts internationally over what to do and how to control this eventuality.

Not too long ago, Madam Speaker, you will note that in this House we discussed a motion introduced by yours truly on the development of hydrogen technology. One of the outgrowths of the petroleum industry in Canada is that we have developed a huge lead over most countries in the world in the development of hydrogen technology. This is unquestionably the energy form of the future to replace petroleum and fossil-based fuels which can do nothing else but eventually cook us all.

We should be exploring the competitive advantages we do have in the petroleum industry and hydroelectric power so we can develop the hydrogen technology that will serve the western world. This will establish a basis not only for a national mission in science but a basis for an entire economic

thrust into the future for Canada. One of the notable features of the free trade agreement is that it robs us of those kinds of mechanisms necessary to do what the report of the hydrogen committee demanded that we do, namely, not only develop this technology but ensure that the ownership of it resides in Canada. Of course, the free trade agreement means that any initiative we may take with respect to hydrogen technology will be immediately sold to the south. There are no limits either on acquisition or any basis on which we can give preference to procurement which, after all, is the basis on which any nation builds the kind of mission that we are talking about concerning hydrogen technology.

I point out to my colleague that the dimensions of the sell-out of this free trade agreement with respect to the future of Canada is almost definite in its dimensions, particularly with respect to energy. The hope of Canada some day leading the world, not only economically but in offering a new model of what a nation can be economically and socially, is being dashed by this agreement.

Mr. Waddell: I have a brief reply, Madam Speaker. As the Hon. Member said, indeed there is a new dimension of a sell-out. Companies will not develop technology because big American companies will be here controlling it all. Look at Amoco taking over Dome. The pattern will start again with American companies taking over our Canadian energy companies. The Government will eventually sell Petro-Canada. If it is re-elected, the Conservatives will probably sell Petro-Canada either to the Americans or to their friends. That is what we are faced with.

What did we get out of putting energy on the table in the free trade deal? We got secure access to the American market to sell our oil and gas. But let us think about that. The Americans need our oil and gas. They are short of energy. All kinds of statistics are there. We have a huge surplus of energy which we are selling to the United States. The United States will need it. What did we bargain for? The access is ridiculous. We do not need to bargain for access because the Americans will take the access. We have 18 years of proven oil reserves left, 35 years of natural gas reserves and a 105 years of coal. If you compare that to what is in the Middle East, the ratio of Canadian oil reserves to current annual production is about 12. OPEC had at the end of 1986 reserves-to-production ratio of 73. Saudi Arabia is at 97 and 217. We have oil and gas now and we will have to develop hydrogen. But they will be gone. What will we do? We will be selling out our energy to the Americans to beat hell. We have agreed that if there is another crisis we have to share energy with the Americans. We have to be crazy to enact this kind of deal. We got nothing for it. The Americans want our energy. They have always wanted a continental energy policy. What did they get with this Mulroney-Reagan trade deal? The Americans got a continental energy policy. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) sold out this country to the Americans.