

Customs Tariff

as such, in my thinking should have remained with the Department of National Revenue. It is not a question of building another empire under the Department of Industry.

I do not want to dwell at great length on the vicissitudes of the Department of Industry or on the great pains that some took to justify its separate existence and extension. Despite the unanimous view on the part of the opposition that it should never have had a separate existence and should have come under the Department of Trade and Commerce, with a changed name perhaps, we find after four years and an expenditure of \$4 million that we now have a Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the more things change, the more they are the same. Do you not agree?

[*English*]

It is my view, therefore, that we would have been better advised to maintain the machinery advisory board under the Department of National Revenue. We need not call it a board. I also think that section 15 of the Department of Industry Act never contemplated the setting up of this type of thing. The house was never really advised what would be the case, and what happened happened in general terms. I therefore feel that that operation would have been better carried out under the Department of National Revenue.

I have stated my reasons and reservations with regard to the ultimate considerations that may move the cabinet and the minister to pass orders in council remitting duty. I think that here there may be a subject of, shall we say, equivocal decision. In this area equivocal decisions may be made by the governor in council under legislation. It is all set out in the minutes I referred to and I will not repeat it. I merely invite hon. members to see what was said at that time. From the way the officials that were concerned answered certain questions I thought they were at some pains to justify the procedure that had been outlined.

Since there are other members who wish to make statements at this time I will conclude my remarks until we come to the individual items.

Mr. John Burion (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, having regard to the subject matter of the bill before the house it is only natural, I think, that we should consider the philosophy

of free trade. Perhaps most hon. members pay tribute to this philosophy; certainly this party is committed to a policy that favours the freeing of international trade, not only with regard to this country but with regard to the entire world. We feel that free trade would contribute to international economic development, to the economic development of Canada and would materially contribute to the eazing of world tensions. Nevertheless, when we consider all these problems we find that talking about them is much easier than solving them. Factors beyond Canada's control militate against our pursuing the objective of free trade in world markets. Since other countries follow policies which tend to restrict world trade, those policies are some of the factors that are beyond our control.

This afternoon I wish to refer briefly to a number of matters which are within our jurisdiction and competence and the factors we must consider when discussing the implementation of this bill. When the Kennedy round negotiations were begun there was great hope throughout Canada and many parts of the world that trade might be liberalized. Unfortunately, what we have achieved is something less than what we hoped for.

It is important for us to recognize the limitations of the gains which have been made as a result of the Kennedy round negotiations. Although we approve of the gains that have been made we must recognize that we have not achieved all our original objectives. We must also recognize that those gains will not all produce fundamental changes which are desirable. At the same time there is a need for constant vigilance with respect to world trade and trading patterns. We need to measure the impact of the changes being made in the Customs Tariff and take action to deal with effects which may hurt or hinder sections of the Canadian economy. I have in mind, particularly, certain problems which may be faced by the agricultural industry. I have already referred to some of them during the resolution stage of the bill, and the parliamentary secretary has also made some comments in this connection. I have no wish to labour the point at this stage, but I repeat my recommendation that the government keep in constant touch with the effects of these changes on various sectors of the Canadian economy.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The whole subject matter of this bill and related measures is, of course, an integral part of Canadian history. There is no need to