

of those important, vital matters? Nothing at all, nothing but attempts to distort. Nothing but sweeping charges without any basis in fact, just charges that the FTA will force Canadian society to become like American society. There has been no proof; just charges, charges that everything that distinguishes Canada from the U.S. will be swept away, all our social programs, regional development, agricultural supply management, cultural policies, all are going to be imperilled. This is not debate, this is trying to spread alarm with broad, general, silly statements.

This is what *Le Devoir* had to say about that in an editorial of August 12:

It is difficult to take seriously the Liberal amendment recommending that the free trade legislation be amended so that it not undermine Canada's social programs, including health care insurance, unemployment insurance, pensions, minimum wage legislation, labour legislation and maternity benefits.

This rhetoric has a hollow ring to it, because none of the programs mentioned is even remotely jeopardized by the (free trade) agreement.

The *Winnipeg Free Press*, the hon. gentleman's home paper, does not think much of him. This is what that paper said about the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) on August 9:

There is room for honest disagreement over the likely effects of free trade on Canada and Canadians. The point at issue in Mr. Turner's approach to free trade is not one of honest disagreement but of simple, deliberate distortion.

John Turner these days has a liking for slogans. "Let the people decide" is his latest. Before the people do decide, he might direct another slogan to himself: "Tell the people the truth."

That was the *Winnipeg Free Press*, not the words of a partisan Member of this House, not the words of an active politician. That is the impartial judgment of the *Winnipeg Free Press*.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that the Hon. Minister's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) has the floor.

**Mr. Rossi:** You are a phoney, John.

**Mr. Crosbie:** You are a phoney and you are a dummy. You are never up to speak.

**Mr. Rossi:** You are a phoney and you did not even read the report and you are a bluffer. You are a big bluffer.

**Mr. Crosbie:** You do not even get up and speak. Let us have your maiden speech.

**Mr. Rossi:** I would rather not speak than tell what you are saying.

**Mr. Crosbie:** All you do is grovel from your seat.

**Mr. Rossi:** Big blabber-mouth, shut up.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, order. Both Hon. Members are out of order. I would like to hear the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray).

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Crosbie) ranting and raving, I was reminded of the story of the lawyer who looked over his brief and wrote beside one paragraph:

### *Time Allocation*

"My case is very weak here. When I get to this point in court, I'm going to yell like hell". That is obviously what has happened here.

All the Minister for International Trade has done with his ranting and raving is to confirm what a weak case the Government has in its attempt to force through a motion to choke off further debate on the Bill to implement the trade deal in only four more days. He has also confirmed, through his ranting and raving, just what a weak case the Government has when it says that it has negotiated a deal with the United States that deserves the support of the Canadian people.

The Deputy Government House Leader, in introducing the Government's motion, attempted to paint a picture of sweet reasonableness, of a true desire to have a useful debate and to give a reasonable period of time for that debate. However, he was soon undermined by the Minister for International Trade who tore away that veil of reasonableness with which the government House Leader attempted to cloak the real position of the Government.

The Minister for International Trade made clear that the Government had no intention, from the very beginning, of allowing a reasonable and proper debate on this trade deal in the House, or of allowing a reasonable and proper debate on this trade deal throughout Canada by the Canadian people. The Minister for International Trade has made this very clear, and in this he has certainly told the truth.

The Minister for International Trade has in fact taken issue with the very desire of Members of this House to have any debate at all on this measure. He said in effect that he and his Party won the last election and therefore they can do whatever they want until the next election. He said that he and his Party have been allowed to form a one-party state, a form of what he might consider to be a dictatorship, benevolent perhaps but a dictatorship all the same.

The fact is that this was not what the Canadian people thought they were doing when they, perhaps with good intentions but now intentions they may well believe were misguided, elected the Minister and his Party to office. The idea of having the trade deal that the Minister's Government negotiated with the United States was never mentioned once during the last election campaign. In fact, the only thought that Canadians might have had about the issue during the election was that it would be the very last thing that a Government led by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) would ever attempt to do. I say this because when that Prime Minister was running for the leadership of his Party, he made very clear, in rejecting the support of the current Minister for International Trade for free trade with the United States, and I think I recall his exact words, that it would undermine our sovereignty and he would have none of it at that time or at any other time.