

*Supply**[Translation]*

I will quote some more, Mr. Speaker. A little later, as reported this time in *Le Devoir* on July 8, 1985, the Prime Minister said: "I agree—with the term "enhancing in trade relations", but not with the term "free trade"". It is interesting to note how much this Prime Minister has changed.

Let us now see, July 18, 1985—

• (1610)

[English]

On that date the Prime Minister was saying: "In a discussion paper released last January that formally launched a debate on free trade, the Government stuck to its terminology of a comprehensive bilateral trade arrangement".

Let us see what we have here. We went to improving trade; we went to saying that we were not discussing free trade; we went to *amélioration des relations commerciales*; and then we went to a comprehensive bilateral trade arrangement. This was in the space of about a year and a half. We see that the Prime Minister's position has gradually changed.

We had a debate on free trade in March of this year. I should like to paraphrase what the Prime Minister said at that time about what we were undertaking with the United States: "We are engaging in negotiations for a trading arrangement under Article 24 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade".

When I heard the Prime Minister make those remarks in March, I immediately left my chair—and I am sorry that I missed part of his speech, but I read it the next day—and went to the Library of Parliament to obtain a copy of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Mr. Speaker, do you know what Article 24 is entitled? It is entitled "Territorial Application, Frontier Traffic, Custom Unions, and Free Trade Areas". That is not bad for a fellow who only some time prior was not negotiating a free trade agreement at all. He did not even want anyone to use the term in his presence because it offended him. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, that he said that to *The Globe and Mail* on June 1, 1983? We were not to discuss free trade in front of him. He did not want to talk about it.

What happened to the Prime Minister over that interval? Obviously, when he was singing with the President on March 17, 1985 in Quebec City that famous song which did irreparable damage to my television set, something happened to the Prime Minister to make him change so that his view went from what it was in 1983 to what it is today.

Mrs. Maily: I hope you do not have any Irish constituents because the song was "When Irish Eyes are Smiling".

Mr. Boudria: Again I hear the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily) making unusual noises across the way. I am sort of looking forward to her contribution in the House, but not all that much because it will probably not happen.

Yesterday the Government released a little booklet, a copy of which I have in hand. It is entitled *Trade Negotiations, Securing Canada's Future*. It contains the following subtitles: "The Talks: What's at Stake, Jobs for the Future, Opportunities Nationwide, Setting Rules for Services, Improving the GATT". This booklet will be used to stuff shopping bags at shopping centres.

Last night I thought I would read it and that I would be enormously well informed after doing so. However, when I first saw it, I asked myself: Why is the Government exposing itself at this point in the free trade negotiations? Government Members have been telling the House of Commons that they cannot reveal what is in the negotiations because they would be damaging their negotiating position. If that is the case, why are they publishing this booklet on trade negotiations?

Further, seeing that the negotiations are not finished, I really wonder about the wisdom of the Government of Canada spending \$12 million of taxpayers' money to convince us that selling our sovereignty to the Americans is good for us. I have some difficulty understanding that.

Nevertheless, I read the booklet last night. I wanted to see what was in it for the people I am called upon to represent in the House of Commons. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I represent an agricultural riding in which there are many dairy farmers, some farmers in the business of egg production and poultry, and generally supply-management agriculture. I had heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) tell us in the past that supply-management would not be negotiated away. We heard the Prime Minister sort of weasel around it but not really ever say that supply-management was not on the negotiating table.

I said to myself that surely the booklet would tell me about supply-management. I turn to page 15, to the paragraph entitled "What About Agriculture?", which reads as follows:

To the extent we can make progress in the Canada-U.S. negotiations in defining allowable subsidies or reducing other non-tariff barriers such as health and technical regulations, it will contribute to the resolution of these problems in the multilateral negotiations.

So far I am wondering what that has to do with agriculture, as you probably are, Mr. Speaker. Further it indicates:

In the bilateral context we are not negotiating the status of farm marketing boards.

A little further on it says:

Both Canada and the U.S. have their own unique systems for marketing farm products in a manner that is responsive to their domestic constituencies. Essentially, agricultural trade issues are global in nature.

I am sure you have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere in there does it say that supply-management will not be negotiated away.

It talks about marketing boards but not about supply-management. Obviously you know, Mr. Speaker, as do all Members of the House, that that is not necessarily the same thing. Many marketing boards have nothing to do with supply-management at this time.