

which is more comparable to Canada, when it comes to cost structures and a way of life?"

That comment is a very interesting one. It calls attention to a very interesting fact. Those who say to Albertans or to Maritimers that they will be enriched by this deal have not looked at Wyoming, or North Dakota, or South Dakota, or Maine—all of which have suffered as a result of U.S. industry fleeing to the south and to Mexico. U.S. industry is cutting back on its cost of production at the expense of the citizens of the northern states.

Let me cite one other view of the consequences of the inevitable homogenization of Canada and the U.S. I quote the words of Mickey Cohen, as reported in the *Financial Times* of November 28, 1988. He had the following to say: "I guess I would have to go after regional development and universality. I would cut out most of the industrial support and the individual industrial programs, particularly the ones geared to the regions. I would go after universality and cut unemployment insurance. I would raise the taxes as well, and I might skew the tax system back towards investment. I think we have to tax more and spend less."

That comment implies the inevitable evolution that will take place. But what has not been recognized is that it is the deliberate intent of this Government and its cohorts in the multinationals to make Canada more like the U.S. It is no accident. And the clues were there when, early in the life of this Government, it began to attack the social programs in this country. It attacked the indexation of old age pensions. It attacked the indexation of family allowances. It then proceeded to eliminate the National Energy Program and FIRA, putting Canada up for sale. Mr. Speaker, who can forget this Government's action with respect to the drug patent legislation?

Well, we were begging for an opportunity to get into this deal at that stage of the game. We wanted to show Mr. Reagan just how committed we were to giving the country away and becoming more like the United States. But that wasn't good enough. And so, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a Government that is absolutely committed to the notion that this country should have its society, its politics, its economy determined exclusively by market forces. It is no accident. This Government wants Canada to become more like the U.S., and that is why we are struggling against this agreement.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has a mandate. And while we have had promises from

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) that the fears that many Canadians have about the need for adjustment programs, and so forth, that the concerns that Canadians have about the threats to regional development programs and the like, will be taken care of by this Government, will be addressed by this Government, one has to bear in mind that guarantees were given that social programs would not be affected, that workers who were displaced would be treated well, to use the kind of phraseology that the Prime Minister is accustomed to using.

And when we engage in this debate—not to defeat the free trade deal, because we know we cannot do that, but to get the Prime Minister to fulfil his promises—we get instead, as my House Leader put it, jackboot democracy. I would refer to it as puerile pettiness, to the extent that my colleague from Essex-Windsor, notwithstanding that it had been intimated by the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. McDermid) that he would be given extended time, was not given the opportunity to complete his remarks.

I have never seen such niggardly behaviour in this place in my life, and that coming at the Christmas season. This Government should be ashamed of its behaviour.

We do not apologize for trying to get this Government to fulfil the promises that the Prime Minister made during the election campaign at least to address the fears that Canadians have in the face of the inevitability of this deal.

But, I digress from the focus of what I want to say.

One of the core claims of this Government is that it is trying to give Canada the opportunity to compete internationally and to do so effectively.

I will not digress again into the question of access to American markets and whether we really have that, or whether the disputes settlement mechanism will work or not. But let's consider the elements of competitiveness in the modern world economy.

It surely cannot be a part of increased competitiveness for a country that spends more money on its energy than any other country in the world, both for industrial purposes and domestic purposes, to give it away, in effect, when in fact our energy resources could be a comparative advantage.

Clearly there is something else afoot among those who suggest that we are going to be more competitive if we say that some of the comparative advantages we have