

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

● (1640)

I say to you, Madam Speaker, we want an election because we want the chance to give Canadians a choice. We want to give Canadians the right to see that there is a different vision of the country.

The Minister for International Trade got into a high dudgeon today about the use of the Senate. He was abusive in his comments about many of our colleagues in the Upper House. It is not surprising, he is abusive of everybody. He forgot one very simple fundamental fact. It was that he was the Minister of Justice who brought in a Bill concerning Senate reform. We agreed with it. Our Leader said: "You bring any proposal on Senate reform, an elected Senate, and we will pass it. We will go along with it". That was in 1985. Who backed off? Who withdrew?

**Mr. Nunziata:** Crosbie the coward.

**Mr. Axworthy:** That is right, the big bad wolf from St. John's West turned out to be Little Red Ridinghood. He simply did not have the guts to follow through. Why? Because he had his own people. He had the Lowell Murrays, the Michel Coggers and all the other guys. He had the Laval team and all the rest of them. They had to be gotten on to the benches too. What hypocrisy to talk about the Trudeau hacks when the Prime Minister and his colleagues have been loading the trenches as fast as they could. Our Senators are prepared for Senate reform. They want an elected Senate. Our Party wants an elected Senate.

**Mr. Malone:** You do not.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Yes, we do. Our Party in national convention voted 78 per cent in favour of an elected Senate. I have not seen a similar resolution on behalf of the Conservative Party.

The Senate is not the issue. The instructions are very simple. Canadians have the right to make a choice on something that is fundamental. One does not shift fundamental ingredients, the rights of a people of a country without giving them the right to decide, especially when they were not told the truth in 1984, especially when the Government went around saying that it did not believe in free trade and that it would never happen. Surely to goodness all we are saying now is that the Upper Chamber is doing what it should do, and not say that it is for or against the Bill but: "Let the people decide. Let them choose. Let them show what they are prepared to do". That is all.

In the final part of my remarks I wish to talk about what that choice will be. Tomorrow our Leader will be speaking. He will outline in detail the kind of trade strategy that we will promote. I want to talk about what I felt and heard over the last three years. I want to talk about the sense I got from all those people who oppose this agreement but who want something different. The people who are against the agreement are not in favour of the *status quo*. They are not in favour of

going back to some kind of little England. That is pure mythology that is being perpetrated.

Do you know what there is, Madam Speaker? There is a new kind of internationalism growing in Canada. There are all kinds of people in business, professions, schools, women's organizations and cultural groups who see Canada as a mature country with an important role to play in the world. They see us being able to help solve the problems in Central America in a way that we could not do before. They see us being able to work out new economic and trade relations in Latin America or in the Middle East. They see us being able to take a different perspective on the great power bi-polarities on nuclear weapons. They really believe that Canada has come of age as Laurier promised—but not as a junior partner to the United States, not as a country which will simply be the tail wagging the dog, a country which has integrated itself so much economically that it has no ability or right to make the types of choices that need to be made in the international arena. They see us, certainly, in an interdependent world.

The way to manage that is not to form a regional block, not to form into some kind of fortress to fight other regions, but to develop new international institutions. I refer to new monetary institutions, new ways of holding corporations accountable, new ways of developing financial fiscal assistance for Third World countries. There is an enormous sense of aspiration and of expectation on the part of Canadians to achieve that. But they know it will be frustrated by this type of agreement.

An interesting group of people is the Lawyers for Social Responsibility. They point out how in God's name this country could in the future ever take on establishing new policies in the Arctic, in Central America or in the United Nations if we become so economically integrated with the United States and when the only program that is allowed under this agreement for regional development is military purchasing. That is really all that is left for us to do. This Government has a White Paper which is probably the most extreme type of example of cold war mongering. I think that Ronald Reagan would blush if he put a document like that. This Government has the capacity sometimes to make Ronald Reagan look good.

We have the ability to do something different, to try to find a new type of internationalism, and we are going to throw it away. We are going to give it away. I was at a conference in Japan this summer. I was having lunch with a young Korean who was part of the Academy of Economics and Science. He is a top economist. He said: "I do not understand this agreement you are going to sign with the Americans. Why are you doing it? Right now, we have to deal with you on investment, trade and tourism. We look to Canada as being a significant and powerful important player. Once you get into this agreement you just come along for the ride with the Americans. We will just have to talk with them from now on".

Down in Central America this spring I was talking with he people there who said: "What about this agreement? We would like you to break the economic embargo in Central