

Honourable senators, I should like to touch briefly on each of the five points mentioned by Senator Barrow. The first is the Canada-New Zealand Trade Agreement, which replaces an agreement that came into effect approximately 50 years ago. Our trade with New Zealand, from the point of view of our exports and imports, does not represent a large portion of our trade in general. In 1979 we exported \$90 million to New Zealand, and we imported \$135 million. However, most of our imports comprised mutton being shipped into Canada and then transhipped to the United States.

Canada, as honourable senators know, has a quota of meat exports to the United States, and I would ask the honourable senator who sponsored the bill to explain the relationship to our quota of the transshipment of meat into the United States. Canadian producers of mutton and lamb were concerned about the large shipments of chilled lamb entering Canada, and an agreement was reached with the New Zealand producers whereby we now have a quota from that country. I believe that the quota was determined by negotiation between producer organizations in Canada and their counterparts in New Zealand, rather than on a government-to-government basis. However, that agreement expires within the next year, and perhaps the sponsor could tell us what stage the negotiations have reached at present.

Honourable senators, before leaving the Canada-New Zealand Trade Agreement, I should mention that it is most unusual to have a trade agreement bootlegged in with amendments to the Customs Tariff. Perhaps there is a logical reason for that. I do not recall that the sponsor explained to us why that is part of this bill to amend the Customs Tariff. Perhaps he could mention that when he closes the debate.

The next section deals with so-called concessions to developing nations. I have no objection to that part of the bill, but there are a couple of situations on which we should have some clarification. First, as to the criteria for establishing a developing nation, which countries will be considered to be developing and which will be considered as having progressed sufficiently that they no longer have the advantage of that classification? Secondly, as to the provision for goods partially produced in one developing country, and transferred to a second developing country, I am wondering which countries would be available for this type of transshipment of goods and how the goods would be stamped when they arrived in Canada. Would it be the country of origin or the country in which the goods are completed? That would be of importance to tourists. When they choose their souvenirs they will want to know whether they were made in Upper Volta or Kenya. The souvenirs would probably be stamped with the names of both countries.

Hon. Jack Marshall: Or P.E.I.

Senator Phillips: The bill provides for the duty-free entry of certain goods for the disabled. Of course, I have no objection to this type of provision. However, there is one matter that causes me some concern. Certain articles will be subject to duty if similar goods are produced in Canada. A paraplegic who suffers a disability as a result of an accident may have far better use of his arms than a paraplegic who suffers a disabili-

[Senator Phillips.]

ty as a result of muscular dystrophy. Yet the type of goods necessary for someone who suffers from muscular dystrophy may be produced in Canada, and those items will not have the advantage of duty-free entry into Canada. Therefore, I hope that officials of Revenue Canada will give the greatest consideration to the need of the patient rather than the type of goods produced in Canada.

The provision dealing with dental goods has been on the agenda several times during the past few years. It came about following an appeal of the Dental Association to the Tariff Board. The board ruled that the duty on dental goods had been collected illegally for several years, largely to justify the bureaucrats who had made the error in the first place. We now find a little movement away from that ruling.

I would point out, honourable senators, that dental products are, in the main, still taxed. For instance, the amalgam used in the so-called silver fillings is still subject to duty, while a number of prostheses may be brought in duty-free. It is not that the amount of the duty charged is excessive—at least, I never considered it to be—but there is always the difficulty that someone has to go to the Customs premises on Walkley Road and spend approximately two hours to pick up something on which there perhaps may be duty payable of 80 cents. It was the waste of time involved more than the duty charged that has been a problem for the dentist.

The section dealing with metrication should be handled with care, because our greatest trading partner is the United States. As honourable senators are aware, the United States has backed away considerably from the move toward metrication, and I doubt very much whether they will ever complete it. In my view, this matter has to be handled with care.

Approximately two weeks ago I enjoyed an item that appeared in the press referring to the Guy Favreau Centre in Montreal. Apparently the washrooms in that building were to be finished in tile, and the specifications were given in metric. Apparently, true metric tile is 100 centimetres by 100 centimetres, but the only tile made in Canada was 104 centimetres by 104 centimetres. So we imported the tile from Japan because it was true metric measurement, and we laid off 55 people in the only company in Montreal that manufactured tile. That is what I mean by using a certain amount of discretion.

Bill C-90 also lists new tariff items on canned fish, which I know will be of interest to the sponsor of the bill. I believe those tariffs were originally removed during this session and they are now being reinstated. In fact, I believe the late Senator John Connolly sponsored that bill during this session. I would like the sponsor of this bill to tell me how these new tariffs relate to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. If I may say so, I am quite happy to see these new tariffs in place because I think our fisheries need more protection. I understand that the bill was before the committee in February, and I see no great need for the same bill to go back to the same committee.