

Time Allocation

A few moments ago, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Cadieux) was accusing the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) of not telling the truth with respect to this agreement. He said that the Leader of the Opposition distorted in a serious way the terms of the agreement, and he referred to his recent questions with respect to the Quebec investment plan. I must say to the Minister of Labour, though he has left the House now, that he himself should practise what he preaches. He has distorted the words of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition at no time said that the Canadian version of the agreement prevented the Quebec Government or the people of Quebec from having their particular stock promotion plan. What he said was the following:

"Nevertheless, the official statement or official interpretation by President Reagan says, on page 86, that a province shall grant investors from the other country the same favourable treatment granted investors from that province.

President Reagan is saying that the Government of Québec cannot use special measures to encourage Québecers to invest in their own province."

I read the response of Premier Bourassa. In his response, he did not refer to the American interpretation. He once again referred to the Canadian agreement and he also referred to the present plan and not to future plans.

When the Minister of Labour and the Minister for International Trade start accusing the Leader of the Opposition of distorting the truth, they should practise what they preach. They should not distort what the Leader of the Opposition said as recorded in *Hansard* of August 11, 1988, at page 18199.

Earlier this afternoon, the—

Mr. McDermid: You're choking on that.

Mr. Allmand: Yes, I am, because I have a cold. I am doing my best, and I wish you would accept that.

Mr. McDermid: You are choking on your own words.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary does not have very much to say so he is trying to bug me about my cold.

Earlier this afternoon, the very rambunctious Minister for International Trade was launching forth, as he usually does, with all sorts of wild statements. Of course, he referred to the proposed action by our Party to delay the passage of this Bill in the Senate in order to force an election so that the people could decide whether or not they want this agreement. It is our policy that since there was no mandate for the free trade agreement with the United States in 1984 and since it is such an important matter that will change the fabric and the nature of this country so much, it should be decided in a national election. We have decided that in order for that to happen, since we are massively out-voted in the House by the large government majority, we will delay the legislation. We will not defeat it but delay it in the Senate so that that can occur.

The Minister for International Trade, of course, was very critical of that. He started making fun of the Senate and referred to the fact that Senators are not elected and were mostly appointed by Liberals. At the beginning of this Parliament, and as a matter of fact, on May 9, 1985, in response to challenges from opposition Parties to reform the Senate, the Government finally put before this House a motion to reform the Senate. That motion to reform the Senate provided that money Bills that were sent to the Senate would be passed automatically after 30 days and non-money Bills that were not passed by the Senate after 45 days would be automatically passed.

The Leader of the Opposition challenged the Prime Minister to proceed with the legislation and said that he would support it, but that was never done. This motion to reform the Senate died on the Order Paper and was never passed by the Government because the Government did not have the political will to reform the Senate.

● (1820)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired.

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here waiting to get in on this debate because I have listened to members of the Opposition moan, cry, weep and complain about time allocation on Bill C-130, an Act to implement the free trade agreement. They say we have not had time to debate. I am going to try to cover some of the points that the opposition Members have raised.

How can we take them seriously? First, the Right Hon. Leader of the Liberal Party said, yes, he would form a coalition government. Then, no, he would not form a coalition government. We have the Leader of the NDP saying, certainly, we will form a coalition. Yes, we have seen the first signs of it. Here it is in a letter to our House Leader. Our House Leader said, let us have an orderly debate, let us have time allocation here, come back with your ideas on time allocation. Here is what they came back with. They proposed, and both the Liberal House Leader and the NDP House Leader signed this, that there should be 150 days of debate at report stage. Then they had the audacity to suggest another 200 days for third reading.

How can you treat the Opposition Parties seriously when they bring in this kind of nonsense? They are talking about over two years of House time in debate. They are talking about ignoring day care, ignoring tax reform, ignoring the refurbishing of the Armed Forces, ignoring a myriad of issues we have to debate in this House. Now they are moaning and groaning because we have limited the debate.