

That's the trouble here, the proponents are stuck with trying "to explain a difficult legal trade document while the opponents can sit back and make the most outrageous statements by pushing the right emotional buttons."

Senator Van Roggen is right, all the way from the sale of Canada to imperilling the very idea of Canada to the free trade agreement representing a fundamental change in the direction of the country to the stock savings plan falsehood to the fish processing falsehood to the harmonization falsehood to undermining the GATT falsehood to fabricated issues like blood and water. The Opposition has taken the low road. It has chosen to distort rather than to debate the issues. It has been a pusillanimous and discouraging exhibition on their part. I am going to talk bluntly here.

The Leader of the Opposition wants to tear up the free trade agreement and the Leader of the NDP wants to tear it down, the big difference between these two characters. One is an up tearer, the other is a down tearer. What do they say they are going to do instead? What is their alternative for Canada?

The most recent Liberal proposal was presented by the Leader of the Opposition to Mr. Bourassa on August 17. Mr. Bourassa was not buying it. He continues to support the free trade agreement. This latest Liberal proposal replaces one announced with much fanfare by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry who is a fandaglio of fanfare. On June 13, he had another fandango. First there was the announcement of June 13 by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry and no one bought that. Then the Leader of the Opposition had another plan. The latest plan had five points, three relating to trade, one relating to international monetary policy and one relating to domestic policy.

The Leader of the Opposition is supposed to be expert on world international monetary affairs because he was the Minister of Finance in the early 1970s. Michael Wilson knows more about it, has more knowledge of it in his little finger than the Leader of the Opposition has in his whole six-foot body. Michael Wilson got the other major countries of the world to agree on the G-7, including Canada, so that we participate in these monetary meetings. Michael Wilson is the Minister of Finance for the eighties.

**Mr. Manly:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe it is well known that we are not to refer to Members by their names but by their positions in Cabinet or their constituencies, and the Hon. Member has done this three times in a row without being rebuked by the Chair.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** I am sure the Hon. Minister is well aware of the rules and will abide by them.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Madam Speaker, this is a very important point and I will be very, very careful in the future not to transgress.

Let me refer to the *Halifax Herald Limited* editorial of August 16, "Turner's trade gambit". After the Leader of the Opposition met with Mr. Bourassa, the editorial said:

### *Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

Indeed, even those who share the Liberal disdain for the trade agreement must be chagrined by the ground which is always shifting under the leader's feet.

First, he wasn't too sure about the deal; next, he was going to rip it up; at one point, he was for free trade but not "this deal"; now, he wants a sectoral agreement and more trade with those Far Eastern countries with which Canada cannot possibly compete in several key areas of the economy.

That is a short and succinct description of the Liberal alternatives to the trade pact. I have not got time this morning to quote it, but I would refer Hon. Members to an article on the same subject by George Bain entitled "Turner's free trade package, is it funny or serious?", concluding that it was neither. It was pitiful. This appeared on August 20 in *The Chronicle-Herald*. He ends up by saying, "Fifth, in light of all that went before, Mr. Turner's talk about being willing to go back to sectoral free trade talks is hokum". That is another objective observer, the dean of Canadian newspaper columnists, George Bain. I recommend that as an excellent article.

● (1230)

Let me give just a couple of quick summations. June 14, "Turner rules out trade pact if Liberals govern", says an article in *The Financial Post*: "Turner made it clear yesterday that he opposes any bilateral free trade deal with the U.S., as he unveiled an alternative economic and trade strategy. The Liberal proposal was contained in a report by a task force chaired by Liberal trade critic, Lloyd Axworthy. The Liberal alternative calls for a strengthening of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade".

Now, imagine! For two years the world has been trying to strengthen GATT. It was our Minister, the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre, who went to Uruguay with the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Hockin) and were very helpful if not largely instrumental in getting the countries there to agree to start the process of negotiating on GATT again, the Uruguay round. Two years later comes the great Liberal alternative. What are they calling for? A strengthening of GATT? Is that not marvellous? We have been trying to do this for the last two years. It took two years for that to sink in to the Johnny-come-latelys and the mind of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry and get him all excited about it.

Here is something else from a CP report: "A future Liberal Government wouldn't seek new bilateral trade agreements with the U.S. or any other country, Liberal trade critic Lloyd Axworthy said today. He said the cornerstone of the Liberal trade policy issued in the June 13 report is a rejection of comprehensive two-way trade deals of the kind negotiated by the Conservative Government. The Party is committed to liberalizing trade with the U.S. and the rest of the world but on a multilateral basis or individual sectors such as the 1965 Canada-U.S. Auto Pact. We are not talking about signing individual free trade agreements, said Axworthy".

Then we go to *The Globe and Mail* of June 27 and discover a new trade critic for the Liberal Party. We have surprise announcements made by the MP for Montreal—Sainte-Marie