

Senator MacEachen: I have heard it stated in government circles that nothing of importance can happen in the negotiations on subsidies with the United States until we know what will happen on subsidies in the GATT round. That means that the resolution of concerns about U.S. trade remedy laws that might occur through these negotiations will be delayed considerably into the future, perhaps even for several years.

I must say that I sympathize to some extent with Senator Murray in trying to put additional evidence on the record this afternoon. He referred to the evidence of Mr. Mel Clark. We heard his evidence, although his views had been made public weeks ago. Mr. Clark's argument, to which Senator Murray took exception today, was uttered before the committee, and we certainly attempted, in the time available within the committee, to resolve that argument. Senator Bazin and Senator Frith, who are both lawyers, joined the discussion, as did Mr. Peter Clark, in an effort not to obscure the point but to see if we could reach a clarification of the relationship between the dispute-settlement provision with respect to antidumping and countervail in the Free Trade Agreement and the dispute-settlement system of the GATT. We did not reach a conclusion, and I think, honourable senators, this underlines the difficulties that we faced in trying to probe each of these items in the very short time available. It was certainly not lack of interest or lack of good will on the part of the committee that made it necessary for the Trade Negotiations Office to attempt to send a letter to the chairman of the committee. We should have had all of that evidence before our committee so that we could have made some finding on that point. But this was impossible, and, presumably, when we go into the next phase of the committee work we shall have to return to that subject.

Our work was force fed, honourable senators, and I believe that it would be better for all of us, and for the country, if we had a lot more time to understand the actual provisions of this agreement rather than having to deal so much with the rhetoric—on both sides. Senator Murray concluded on a high rhetorical note today, adding nothing to the analytical understanding of the provisions of the bill, but building up a rhetorical momentum that might be serviceable in selling the Free Trade Agreement, even though it is not understood. He took the occasion to again try to clear up the mess that had been created in the committee by the evidence we heard on the temporary entry provisions.

Senator Frith: It is terrible!

Senator MacEachen: We are now in another difficulty here. I believe that in his speech Senator Murray directly contradicted testimony which we heard in the committee. I do not have that testimony available because it has not yet been printed.

The majority of members of the committee notes in the report as follows:

with respect to the provisions for the temporary entry of business persons, the evidence presented to the Committee created confusion—

It sure did.

Senator Frith: That is the nicest thing you could say about it.

Senator MacEachen: That was the third draft, each draft becoming less tart than the preceding one.

—the evidence presented to the Committee created confusion and cast doubt on the conceptual foundation and adequacy of preparations for the promulgation of implementing regulations;

Now, if what we heard was incorrect, and if what Senator Murray said was correct, then we ought to have had all of that in the committee and settled it so that we are not left today with a majority of the committee saying that the temporary entry provisions seem to be badly conceived and half baked.

Senator Frith: And contradictory.

Senator MacEachen: And contradictory. In my opinion the evidence is contradictory to what Senator Murray has said. So I have made two comments about the evidence, those same points that have been mentioned by Senator Murray—namely, the important evidence of Mr. Mel Clark, who is not an amateur in the field. He is not someone who came off the street and said, "I have a couple of views to express." He is an experienced former trade official whose views will at least have to be listened to, and disagreed with if necessary, but because of the time constraints we did not get that opportunity.

I have dealt with those two points because they have been raised by Senator Murray. He has found it necessary to raise them because we did not have the time to get the evidence in the committee, not because we were not interested. We tried hard. However, I want to congratulate Senator Murray on the final part of his speech in which he welcomed and promised cooperation by the government with the work of the committee. The committee now has a mandate from the Senate to monitor the implementation of the Free Trade Agreement and related trade developments.

● (1520)

I draw to the attention of the Leader of the Government that the committee expressed a view on two other points, and I hope that the government will cooperate with respect to these two particular points that the committee has stressed. We point out that in the United States an annual report is called for on the progress being made in the many negotiations that will be commencing soon, including the results of the working group charged with establishing a bilateral regime governing antidumping and countervail duties. The U.S. will report to Congress on these matters, and we are suggesting that the Canadian government should report to the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian public annually. We think it would help our work; we think it would be useful; and I believe the committee was unanimous in making that suggestion.

The second point is that the U.S. government has submitted a report to Congress on Canadian compliance with the Free Trade Agreement. Canada should have a report on American compliance with the Free Trade Agreement, and we are asking that such a report be provided by the Canadian government early in the new year. I draw these points to the attention of