

*Softwood Lumber Products Export Charge Act*

and I quote: "I would like to draw a parallel to clear up the misunderstanding about the differences referred to by Miss Carney. We are talking here about monitoring. A shareholder of a company receives a financial statement every year. He can look at the statement and find out what has been happening. If a decision to impose countervail had been made, the United States would have had the right to send in a team of internal auditors regularly to check our books. The difference is that under the present agreement, we will be producing our own statistics which will then be made available to the parties concerned. If the Americans want to look at those figures, they may do so. But there will be no team of internal auditors traipsing around our Department of Forestry."

Mr. Speaker, this means that even the Liberal Party will have access to the statistics published by the Canadian governments concerned.

I may point out that the official Opposition, as represented by the speakers I have heard up to now, consists mainly of Members from basically urban ridings. I do not have the impression that the Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) has a lot of forestry activity in his riding.

I would like to take this opportunity to read to you part of an editorial by Michel Roy who is possibly one of the most objective journalists in Canada and who described even better than I could what motivates Liberal Members in their eloquent rhetoric on practically every subject.

This particular issue, with its forestry connection, is a good example of the confusion reigning in the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker. Later on, I will have an opportunity to address the Liberals' confusion about the economy, the Constitution and national defence—three issues on which that party has no idea where it is going, and in which Canadians cannot place their trust.

To get back to the debate on this Bill, Mr. Roy pointed out, and I quote:

"The Opposition whose exaggerated language gives a gross caricature of a very disturbing issue for the future of the Canadian economy will not be taken seriously by Canadians who are aware of the facts. And the Canadian people will not listen either to its criticism because they know that the Liberal Party has no clear policy on free trade". To say the least.

We only have to read over excerpts from the proceedings of a seminar held by western Liberals on July 2 and 3 to learn about the spokesman of the Liberal Party on trade, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy). We also have to read the comments of Senator Van Roggen who is not a Tory senator. That Liberal senator is an authority on trade and he attended the seminar led by the Liberal Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry.

Senator Roggen said the following: "You heard no fair-minded statement at our seminar. There was only an appeal to your lowest instincts".

Therefore, I think, Mr. Speaker that such a statement made by a Liberal senator, a Canadian authority on trade relations, has resulted in the Liberal spokesman on trade issues, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry, losing all credibility.

The same senator added this:

"Canada is now part of a world that is increasingly competitive and protectionist and which no longer allows for discussing and waiting indefinitely before taking action." I will say to my dear colleagues opposite that the *status quo* is unacceptable and provides no solution for the future. Current and future economic prospects in Canada are inextricably linked with those in the United States, whether we like it or not, and Ottawa had better realize it and act accordingly."

This is what this Government has done, Mr. Speaker, negotiating day after day agreements of major importance to all Canadian provinces, and this agreement that has just been reached is a good illustration of this Government's pattern of action. We were used to living in a country where quarrels and frictions were the way of life. This has changed over the last two and a half years. And the results are there to prove it.

All this to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the area of trade relations and the economy, this Government has absolutely no lesson to learn from the official Opposition, and especially from their trade critic, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry who even in western Canada is yet unable to strike a consensus among Liberals on the matter of freer trade negotiations with the Americans.

Mr. Speaker, they keep talking about sovereignty. The best way for a country to exercise its sovereignty is in the first instance to ensure an economic renewal, and if this Government has failed to prove it in two and a half years, remember the Liberal Party's record. During the last five years of their mandate, they were creating 1,255 jobs a month, while this Government has created 25,000 jobs a month for two and a half years. In all areas of Canada the unemployment rate is steadily declining, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting to hear Liberals talk about sovereignty, about protecting our sovereignty when we know so well that in Liberal parlance this is the be-all and end-all of the constitutional issue in Canada. After having put Quebecers to sleep for fifteen, twenty years, Mr. Speaker, they threw us out in 1982. It is also interesting to see Members from the New Democratic Party use the word "sovereignty" on each and every occasion. I look forward to the next convention of the New Democratic Party, to see how far they will bend backwards to get votes in Quebec.

You may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that Quebecers remember where the New Democratic Members were in 1982 when it was time to defend minority rights. All that, and certainly I will have the opportunity to return to that in other debates, to illustrate the Liberal Party's lack of specific policies, the total absence of programs on economic matters, on constitutional matters. How can we have confidence in a