

senior elected government representatives, and then we should wait for both parties bilaterally to decide what subsidies are for five to seven years.

Throughout the American election campaign the Democratic presidential candidate and the vice-presidential candidate, who incidentally was thoroughly familiar with the purported free trade deal, never once to my knowledge, and I doubt any Member of this House is able to say otherwise, raised the issue of free trade. Even though the Democratic ticket was in a desperate situation they never once said the President or the Vice-President, now the President elect, were taken to the cleaners by the Canadian negotiators. Yet we fought an entire election campaign on it in Canada.

I know Canadians are good. I know we are strong. I know we are competitive. I know we can get things done with the best in the world. However, would you not think that at some point someone would have suggested that maybe, just maybe, there was some kind of a flaw in this agreement as it relates to the U.S.? Michael Dukakis or Lloyd Bentsen could have said this is not as good a deal as it appears for the U.S. Not a peep, and I think that is worrisome to Canadians, as it should be.

The fact of the matter is that we have to go on from here because one o'clock tomorrow morning this Bill will be passed. It will become the law of the land. Then it becomes a question of what do we do with it. How do we ensure that what we have put forward as legitimate concerns will be addressed? Are we going to leave it, for example, to someone like the chief negotiator for Canada?

When I run an election campaign, I am prepared to confront legitimate argument. I believe the participation of the chief negotiator for Canada during the election campaign was absolutely atrocious and irresponsible. I think Simon Reisman did a disservice to the Public Service of this country. He was paid by the taxpayers of this country for years and years. He worked in the most sensitive of positions, and was given a mandate to negotiate a deal. All of that is legitimate because he had been given those kinds of mandates before. However, to come back into the give and take and the heat of an election campaign and sit there in a mean-spirited way and defend his own work as a Public Servant of this country on the payroll of the Government of Canada was one of the most despicable actions ever undertaken by a Public Servant in the history of this nation.

Many of us know how little tolerance the chief negotiator for Canada has for people who oppose his

point of view on anything. We know what he thinks of anyone who does not agree with him. We know what he purportedly thought of the chief negotiator for the U.S. He was a little red-headed kid still wet behind the ears. In years to come a hard assessment will be made of the disservice that Simon Reisman did to this country. If he behaved in the negotiations on behalf of Canada as irresponsibly as he behaved during the election campaign, we can only fear the worst.

I have some difficulty with the perception which has been created, that to question the free trade deal is to drive business out of Canada or discourage Canadians from continuing their entrepreneurial spirit, or that somehow those who question how this deal will impact on our way of life are letting down the side from an economic point of view. The fact is that Canada, regardless of the Free Trade Agreement, will have to continue to act multilaterally. If everyone to your right believes we should have all our eggs in the American basket, I think that is a very dangerous road to follow.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that Canada could not survive without this deal, at least at the level to which we have become accustomed. Yet in the same breath he painted a glowing picture of his and his Government's accomplishments on the economic front over the last four years. It begs the question as to why we had to move bilaterally when traditionally nations like Canada are always safer and better served when dealing, in trade and other matters, on a multilateral basis.

• (1750)

The fear Canadians have is not just a fear that has been raised that senior citizens are concerned about their pensions. Senior citizens have a commitment to the country that they feel viscerally. They understand. They comprehend. They have been through it. I think it belittles senior citizens in New Brunswick and in Canada to suggest that because legitimate concerns and questions are raised that they are not able to make a serious judgment based on their own knowledge, their own capacities and experiences. Senior citizens have always understood the necessity to protect the vulnerable in this society because that is the way that Canada has developed for many, many years.

The Prime Minister and the free trade negotiator have promised prosperity in our time. They have returned from Washington with a document. All we can hope is that prosperity in fact will be the result. There was no will on the part of the Government to recognize