

*Supply*

what the Hon. Member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso (Mr. O'Neil) has said.

As to the first part of the Member's comment that somehow Mr. Murphy or his cohorts in the U.S. are supposed to be making these public declarations the way they are at the same time as our negotiator is supposed to be keeping quiet, the logic of it somehow escapes me. If they are negotiating in private, they should both do it, and if they are negotiating in public they should both do that as well. It should not be one person operating under one set of rules and another person operating under another set.

In terms of my making comments here in the House of Commons, I would suspect that an American congressman speaking in the United States probably would want to ensure that his area is well protected. He has the right to do so. I have the right just as well to speak here to ensure that the interests of the farmers, the shoe manufacturers, the factory workers and everyone else in the riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell who asked me to represent them in the House of Commons are heard here, and that is exactly what I intend to do.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I have a brief question. I appreciate the Member's representations on behalf of his constituents in the rural communities. I have met with many farm groups, including the milk farmers, not only in my area but across this province and from across Canada.

One of the good things about these negotiations is the consultative process that is going on. It is the biggest consultative process ever put together for a project such as this. It has proved very beneficial and has provided the Government and our negotiators with some very pertinent information.

The final sentence in the speech of the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell was that the Government had better smarten up and do something. The Government is doing something. We are having negotiations on a bilateral trade agreement with the United States.

The Liberals have not yet decided what their policy is on trade. We hear from the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) on one side that he is against the negotiations. We hear from the Hon. Member for St. Henri—Westmount (Mr. Johnston) that he is in favour of the negotiations. The Right Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) agrees with both of them. We are not sure exactly where the Liberal Party stands or what it would do differently. Would the Liberals negotiate a bilateral agreement with the United States, our largest trading partner and the largest trading bloc in the world today? Or would the Liberals stick with the GATT process, which is a long drawn out one, probably four years to negotiate and a number of years to implement after that? Just exactly what would Liberals do when it comes to trade negotiations? Would they have them or would they run away and hide?

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, the people who have chosen to run away and hide when issues become a little too contentious are those across the way. They are the ones who made 338 promises and have tried to weasel out of most, if not all of them with the exception of capital punishment, which is probably the only one they should not have delivered.

I do not apologize that we here on this side of the House of Commons are trying to hold this Government accountable. We are trying to tell the Government that it cannot say something in 1983, something different in 84 and something yet different in 1985 and then talk about free trade in 1986. The people of Canada just will not go for that. What we need from the Government is a Government that is honest and sincere with the people, telling them exactly what is going on every step of the way, recognizing that some of the things being negotiated have to be done in private. Any negotiator knows that and all Members of the House of Commons know that.

We need, nevertheless, some basic assurances from the Government. We are not getting them. Not only that, but we are not getting what the same Government and the same Prime Minister promised some time ago. I could reread every single one of those contradictory statements that I read 10 minutes ago. That is not what the Government was elected to do. It was not elected to say one thing and do the opposite. The Government is elected to govern.

Our role here in the House of Commons is to hold the Government accountable. I intend on my part to continue to do that. I do not want to see the supply-management system given away by this Government when it has so far refused to give the assurance that it will not be. I challenge the Hon. Member across the way to show me in the documentation given out in shopping centres yesterday where it says that supply management will be protected. I will even lend him my copy of the document if he does not have one.

● (1630)

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, I have a short comment and a question. It seems to me there have been three aspects to this debate. The first is a fight over what the free trade negotiator, Mr. Reisman, has been saying. The Minister claims the Government and Mr. Reisman have been consistent. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) said they were inconsistent and that this was hurting negotiations.

The second aspect is a debate on Investment Canada itself. The Hon. Member for Broadview—Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) made a case for the fact that Investment Canada is not working properly in monitoring the commitments made by foreign firms involved in takeovers of Canadian firms.

The third aspect is the broad ideological debate on foreign investment. The NDP has, I think, a fairly straightforward position on that. We are not against foreign investment but we think it needs control. The investors have to be forced to reinvest their profits, do research and development in Canada, get Canadians on their boards of directors and as partners,