

an increasing number of Canadians were against the Prime Minister's trade deal.

If the Prime Minister's trade deal with the United States is so great why must we spend another \$6 million to convince ourselves that surrendering our sovereignty to another country is in our best interests? How can the Prime Minister justify this? How can the Minister justify this?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the type of devious tactics that are being used by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman's question comes from a report in *The Globe and Mail* today which received the information under the Freedom of Information Act. It refers to last year's budget for free trade communications where a special audit was done that gave us the assurance that all tax dollars were spent properly. As the House knows, last year a total of \$16 million was spent. The article and the information detail and outline what was spent. The free trade printing cost \$6 million.

Every inquiry and poll in Canada shows that the public wants more information on the free trade agreement, and by golly we are going to see that they get it. They got it last year, and it cost money to print; and they are going to get it this year, so that they will get the truth, the facts, and not the deceit and deception of hon. creatures like the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. Boudria: It has been said that the opposite to the truth has never been stated with greater accuracy, and that would apply today.

[Translation]

COST OF TRADE AGREEMENT—REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT JUSTIFY EXPENDITURES

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): I would like to put a supplementary to the Minister. So far, the Prime Minister's trade agreement has cost Canadians a total of \$44 million: \$20 million for the negotiating team, \$14 million for advertising and now another \$14 million to convince Canadians that handing over their sovereignty to the United States of America is in their best interests.

How can the Minister justify this kind of spending? How can he justify spending taxpayers' money on advertisements of the kind referred to by the Hon. Member for Shefford earlier today, in which Canadians are asked to believe statements that are utterly false?

● (1500)

[English]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman asked me about the Hon. Member for Shefford. I have in my hand a Canadian Press report wherein a Granby Simonds official, J. P. Patry, said there is no connection between the plant closing and the trade deal. Patry, the plant controller and a native of Granby, also said he would have no stake in protecting the parent

company since he is one of the 131 workers who will be laid off.

The hon. gentleman, knowing of this statement by this official who will be laid off himself, got up in the House with deliberate deception and suggested that the Granby plant was being closed because of the free trade agreement—deliberate deception of the Hon. Member for Shefford, deliberate.

* * *

[Translation]

RAILWAYS

SURVIVAL OF MONTREAL SOUTH SHORE LINES—REQUEST FOR MORATORIUM

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed either to the Deputy Prime Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. It concerns the survival of Montreal's south shore commuter railway line. Since the line between Beloeil and Montreal's Central Station is suppose to close on August 31, is the federal Government prepared to pay the cost of a moratorium on the closing, to give a federal-provincial task force time to examine ways in which these lines can be maintained on a permanent basis, with the support of the federal, provincial and municipal governments?

[English]

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet would not be in a position to make a decision like that at the moment because, under the new National Transportation Act, there is a process the NTA goes through. A railway applies to abandon. Anyone who is interested can appear at public hearings. The NTA then has certain guidelines it can follow in determining whether a line is economical or uneconomical. It can be kept on. Interested parties can purchase the short railway and run it themselves. A huge number of possibilities can occur under the new National Transportation Act that Parliament recently passed.

As well, over-all the railways are limited to a 4 per cent reduction each year. Change is inevitable in certain instances simply because the dynamics of Canada are changing *vis-à-vis* railway and other methods of transport. Parliament put a 4 per cent maximum on the reduction and I thought that was pretty wise.

[Translation]

RETENTION OF RAILWAY SERVICES FOR SUBURBAN AREAS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

M. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The Parliamentary Secretary says that change is inevitable. I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary never travelled on one of these trains from Montreal's south shore. They go back to 1925, have no washrooms or heating and are among the oldest trains in this