

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

the Opposition was. Our sovereignty is imperiled, gone or endangered. Our nationhood is going to disappear because we are going to have a different commercial arrangement with the U.S. That was the call.

For those who opposed Canada-U.S. free trade, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had a name for them in 1911, and I quoted him at second reading. I noticed that several newspapers got the quotation wrong. They attributed to me what Sir Wilfrid Laurier had said. I would have been glad to have been his speech writer in 1911 so long as I could still have been here today. Sir Wilfrid Laurier called those who opposed Canada-U.S. free trade in 1911 and I quote him: "The freaks of unreasoning passion". That is a perfect description of those who oppose Canada-U.S. free trade today, freaks of unreasoning passion. They cry out that you are not a true Canadian. How often have we heard that in the last few months? You are not a true Canadian, you are somebody who is willing to sell out your country if you are for Canada-U.S. free trade.

The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) calls the legislation we are debating today the sale of Canada Act. That is the best he can do in his cheap jaunts across the country spreading misinformation about this legislation. When he says it is the sale of Canada Act, he is not just accusing Members of Parliament on this side of the House, the Government, of being traitors to their country, people prepared to sell out their country. He is accusing prominent members of his own Party. That includes Premier Bourassa. Of course, that accounts for his cool response to the importunities of Mr. Turner who went to see him on August 17, and we cannot say he got a rapturous embrace. He was hoping it would be indecently close but it was not. No criminal charges could be laid as a result of that visit.

Premier McKenna of New Brunswick, another prominent Liberal, who said the free trade agreement is in the national interest and in the interest of his province, is being called by his national leader, just as we are, a traitor to Canada, a person who supports the sale of Canada Act. If you are willing to sell your country, does that not indicate you are a traitor, you are a sleeveen, you are a less than desirable person, that you are unpatriotic.

● (1120)

It indicates to me that you are guilty of treason. Yet, this is the kind of statesman-like utterance we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and their lieutenants for months now.

This is not new. Sir Wilfrid Laurier suffered from the same, what he called, freaks of unreasoning passion. Were these leaders of the colony of Canada before Confederation any less Canadian for entering a reciprocity treaty with the United States in 1854? This goes back as far as 1854. Who would claim that Canada was diminished or weakened as a result of that initiative? The opposite, of course, is true.

Were Sir John A. Macdonald and, after him, Alexander MacKenzie, failing to serve Canadian interests when they sought to renew reciprocity with the United States in the 1870s? They wanted a continuation of the reciprocity arrangements. Were they traitors to Canada? Of course they were not, and no one would suggest that they were.

Was Sir Wilfrid Laurier putting in peril the very idea of Canada when he campaigned in 1891 on unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? Was he putting in peril the very idea of Canada when he reached an agreement for this in 1911? No, of course he was not putting in peril the very idea of Canada, and his descendants, those people who say they belong to the same Party as Sir Wilfrid Laurier, are today saying that this U.S.-Canada free trade agreement puts in peril the very idea of Canada. What specious nonsense, what malicious tripe. One is statesman-like to keep one's language so moderate when one thinks of the nonsense we have heard in the House on this.

Were Canadian governments doing anything other than acting in the national interest in the 1930s when they entered into two Canada-U.S. trade agreements to reduce tariffs? Were they then acting contrary to the Canadian national interest? Of course they were not. Did Canada become any less Canada as a result of these two treaties of the 1930s? Of course it did not.

In 1945 Mackenzie King had a negotiation proceed between Canada and the United States for free trade. Simon Reisman was then a young man entering the government service. He was one of the secret coterie of people appointed by Mackenzie King to negotiate a free trade agreement with the United States. Was Mackenzie King then a traitor? Was he putting in peril the very idea of Canada when he had that negotiation initiated?

Of course we all know that he did not go through with it. He got cold feet in the end. No one in the Cabinet knew what he was up to and his descendants in the Liberal Party today complain that there was not sufficient consultation when the Cabinet was not even consulted in those days. I have suggested before that he consulted only his mother, then in the afterworld, in reaching that decision.

When Louis St. Laurent led the Government in the late 1940s and 1950s and arrangements were entered into with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, were they then betraying their country or endangering the very idea of Canada simply because we were going to get a more sensible set of rules for international trading, Canada being an international trader? Of course they were not, as Mackenzie was not. There was very little consultation of course. The public was not consulted. The public was not asked to vote on whether or not we should join GATT.

Lester Pearson was denounced in 1965 for selling out the auto industry. Who denounced him? Why, the precursors of the New Democratic Party, the swivelling socialists. You don't know where they are going to swivel to next. They denounced