

● (2210)

However, that is not all. Mr. Chrétien, speaking for the Trudeau government, made sure that no one could have any delusions about what Mr. Trudeau was promising. Towards the end of the referendum campaign Mr. Jeffrey Simpson of the *Globe and Mail* asked Mr. Jean Chrétien on CTV's *Question Period* what Mr. Trudeau's "renewed federalism" meant. Mr. Chrétien replied, and I quote:

What we have to do, basically, is to recognize some basic principles that should preside over the elaboration of a new constitution. The principles are that you need a national government;... that the federal government should be strong enough to be able to redistribute the wealth of Canada, and all that being done without giving any province a real special status.

One person who could not possibly have deluded herself about what Mr. Trudeau meant was the Honourable Senator Solange Chaput-Rolland. After all, she had been a member of the Pepin-Robarts commission that had proposed to Mr. Trudeau, as she has so often written, something close to the Meech Lake Accord, and she certainly made no secret—in numerous articles—of her anger at Mr. Trudeau for rejecting her constitutional blandishments. Suddenly, now she says she believes what she earlier knew not to be so.

What is wrong with that? What is wrong is that she encourages those who wish to deceive moderate Quebecers and make them bitter towards the national Government of Canada. What these people are saying—and it is a carefully orchestrated campaign of lies—is: "Those of you who voted against the Péquistes were tricked; you were lied to; you cannot trust Ottawa." It is a common tactic, the "we was robbed" tactic of the boxing manager. In this instance it is destructive of national unity, because it tells the citizens of a whole province that they cannot trust the rest of Canada. At this particular time it is particularly destructive. "You was robbed." It is a natural reflex. The Secretary of State, the Honourable Lucien Bouchard, was in the grip of that reflex, no doubt, when he said, during the campaign, that opposition to the free trade deal was a sinister, anti-Quebec plot hatched in Ontario—even though some of his cabinet colleagues were saying all over Ontario that it was Ontario which would most benefit from the trade deal. Pitting one province against another in a country such as ours is destructive of national unity.

However, I believe that the Honourable Senator Chaput-Rolland now truly believes what she earlier knew so well not to be so. Why do I believe that? Because I too have sinned. I once believed what I knew not to be believable. I once believed that in the Joint Committee on Canada's International Relations, of which both Senator Doyle and I were members, Tories and Liberals could use the same words to mean the same things. My father had warned me about the danger of making such assumptions. But I forgot, and I signed a document thinking its words meant what I thought they meant, in their entirety and in their context.

[Senator Giganti's.]

I am referring, of course, to the statement made by Senator Doyle in this chamber on December 13. He said, and I quote:

We urged that the Prime Minister immediately undertake the steps that would lead to a treaty that would produce freer trade between the United States and Canada.

Let me read to you what was actually recommended in the report that Senator Doyle and I both signed. I quote from page 147:

The committee recommends that the government make strenuous efforts to achieve orderly and balanced trade liberalization.

The committee believes it is important to begin a new round of multilateral trade negotiations as expeditiously as possible.

It is essential that any agreement between Canada and the United States be entirely consistent with the obligations of both countries to the GATT.

Honourable senators, these recommendations summarize the foreword and chapter six of the report written by the Joint Committee on Canada's International Relations.

Let me give you some more quotations. On page 14 of this report it says:

Most of these witnesses were worried that U.S. influence of one kind or another would undermine the country's independence. This concern showed itself in several policy contexts.

Then on page 68:

As we discussed in our interim report, these factors persuaded the government that it was necessary to explore the possibility of negotiating freer trade arrangements with the United States.

Honourable senators, the anxiety by all of the witnesses was clearly expressed. It was not something that this committee—or at least the Liberal members of this committee—signed enthusiastically; they signed with apprehension. The context in which we discussed the Free Trade Agreement with the U.S. was the GATT context and Article XXIV of the GATT, which defines a free trade zone as one in which all tariffs are eventually eliminated. We did not recommend, nor did we discuss, giving away such things as we gave away in Article 1603 of the Free Trade Agreement, relinquishing our GATT rights to impose conditions on foreign investors. Nor did we discuss in the committee giving Americans the right to buy unconditionally any Canadian company, as is set forth in the annex to Article 1607.3 of the Free Trade Agreement. We thought we were signing a document that dealt with what we had discussed. In the event, we are told by Senator Doyle that we signed much more. It was our mistake. Next time we Liberals should have lawyers define every word before we sign a unanimous report.

● (2220)

Therefore, honourable senators, if I could be led to believe what I earlier knew I should not believe, why should I object to Senator Chaput-Rolland showing the same intellectual frailty