

for co-operative action of Meech Lake. That is why we had only three amendments. We have agreed to the Bill in question, Bill C-72, on this side of the House. It is the other side of the House that is holding up the Bill.

Could the Prime Minister cite one example in parliamentary history when a Party that was seriously committed to passing a Bill has brought in 25 amendments yet not setting out to destroy it? Can he give me one example?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor of the NDP brought in over 70 amendments to the Investment Canada Act.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: We opposed it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: You are making our argument.

[*Translation*]

BILL C-72—NATURE OF GOVERNMENT'S AMENDMENTS

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to Bill C-72, on Official Languages. It seems that the number of amendments that will be proposed by the Government is quite substantial. Apparently, there will be more than twenty.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister to inform the House about the nature of these amendments. We want to ensure that they will not take the Bill back to prehistoric times . . .

Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could call the House to order so that I can ask the Prime Minister to inform us about the nature of the amendments . . .

An Hon. Member: . . . out of order!

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): . . . it is not! Since the Government is going to present these amendments, Canadians have a right to know what they involve.

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I don't have the amendments here and I haven't seen them. The Bill is before the parliamentary committee. If I am not mistaken, amendments will be presented by a number of Members on this side of the House and also by the Official Opposition, by the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier.

Am I right? Well, We'll see!

An Hon. Member: We'll see!

Mr. Mulroney: He says we'll see. I suppose we can assume the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier is exercising his rights as a Member here in the House, just like the other Members.

Oral Questions

What I find surprising is that his colleague, right next to him, didn't know he had any amendments.

CONSEQUENCES OF AMENDMENTS TO BE INTRODUCED

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister to stop playing stupid and tell us outright what the nature of these amendments are, not what Joe Blow wants but what his Government wants to change in the Official Languages Bill.

Could he at least give the House the assurance, and that is my question, that the multitude of amendments his Government intends to propose will in no way change the fundamentals of Bill C-72?

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Hon. Member doesn't like Joe Blow, but I kind of like the fellow. The Hon. Member is talking about amendments but I haven't seen them. They will be presented at the appropriate time, like the amendments of the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier.

I have said on several occasions, and I say it again today, that the Bill is important, that the principles it contains will be protected, and that the integrity of the legislation is being strengthened. I hope that with the help of the Hon. Member from Montreal, we will be able to advance further the vital cause of bilingualism in Canada, and do so in a climate devoid of any partisanship and on a higher plane than the one suggested by the Hon. Member.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—
PROVINCIAL LABOUR LAWS

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. He received bouquets from Ken Harrigan, President of Ford Canada, who complimented the Government on the free trade proposal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shields: Bob White must be on the phone.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): Wait for it.

Mr. Murphy: The reason is quite obvious because Mr. Harrigan went on to say that he had concerns about provincial laws, overtime, pensions, workers' compensation, and workplace safety. Will the Minister not agree the reason Mr. Harrigan supports the trade initiative is that he is now able to avoid those provincial laws which protect Canadian workers?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows full well that the U.S.-