was Mr. Broadbent not listening during the House of Commons debate the day before? If he had been, he would have heard the trading arrangement we seek with the U.S. defined in precisely those terms.

Let me restate our motion: "that this house supports the negotiation of a bilateral trading arrangement with the U.S., as part of the government's multilateral trade policy, while protecting our political sovereignty, social programs, agricultural marketing systems, the auto industry and our unique cultural identity".

I defy anyone to tell me the difference between Mr. Broadbent's list and my motion. I wish <u>The Journal</u> had asked him to tell the difference. There is no difference, none at all, which begs the question of why the N.D.P. voted against the motion in the house. As Abraham Lincoln once said, "what kills a skunk is the publicity it gives itself".

Speaking of the Liberals, their behavior in the great trade debate was equally puzzling. John Turner moved an extremely lengthy and convoluted amendment to the motion. As the speaker said, "...the amendment is unusually long and complex. I think the chair must comment that it comes quite close to being a disguised or expanded negative...".

I find it strange that both opposition parties voted against the motion, when the leader of one later essentially accepted the motion on national T.V. and the other used a complex amendment to mask the fact that many of its members support free trade and others don't.

It would be pretty difficult to determine either opposition party's national trade strategy on the basis of their participation in that crucial parliamentary debate - one that they had sought for months.

As I have indicated, our motion stated that our bilateral talks are an intrinsic part of our multilateral trade policy. In the GATT round, we have spearheaded efforts to resolve a particularly pressing problem: the current crisis in world agriculture. In fact, the Prime Minister was the first leader at the seven-member economic summit to push for serious reform in agriculture.