

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, there are more than a few questions that come to mind after listening to the minister's presentation. Nevertheless I will restrict myself to three brief questions.

The minister seems to imply that the concerns that many people are raising are premature and in fact perhaps paranoid. Therefore, I would like to ask the minister, in his honest assessment, who does he see as being the winners and losers in the Dunkel document as it stands now? If this were the basis for a final settlement who in Canada would win and lose?

The second question is about annex 7(e) and the whole question of the Crow benefit. Yesterday the negotiators said that 7(e), as it appears in the text, is not necessarily linked to the question of method of payment, yet the minister, by introducing these documents into the grain transportation hearings on the prairies, has clearly linked the question of method of payment to what is happening at the GATT, thereby undermining the support of grain farmers for the GATT process. He has further intensified those kinds of fears on behalf of grain farmers several minutes ago by introducing an amendment that would remove the Crow benefit in its present form from the motion before us.

The third question I would like to ask him is this. Although it may be a political question of whether economic impact studies are done, the Oldman dam decision has said that when policy decisions with environmental impacts are made by the government, there is a clear legal requirement that the government do environmental impact analyses. Are the processes in place to do those environmental impacts of changes at the GATT before the deadlines which the GATT process imposes upon us?

**Mr. McKnight:** Mr. Speaker, first I would like the hon. member to point out where I suggested that people were being paranoid and premature in their concern. I would like him to point that out.

**Mr. Funk:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps while I look that up, the minister could answer the other two questions that I raised.

**Mr. McKnight:** Maybe the hon. members would be able to co-operate. I would like to quickly attempt to answer the three questions.

### *Supply*

Canada's objective, when we entered into this Uruguay round, was to get substantial reductions in trade distorting subsidies, in particular in export subsidies. These were positions we had developed with the industry. In the Dunkel text there is a clear definition of trade distorting agricultural support. It defines other domestic support, which is to be reduced by 20 per cent over six years. It calls for export subsidy spending to be reduced on the financial side by 36 per cent. It calls for a 24 per cent reduction in volume.

Those are benefits, and consistent with our objectives of where we—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. The time for questions and comments has now expired.

*[Translation]*

Before resuming debate, the Chair wishes to inform the House that the motion in amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture is admissible.

The debate will now be on the main motion and the motion in amendment.

Earlier today the opposition House leader requested and obtained unanimous consent for dividing his party's speaking time into thirds. In other words, there will be three Liberal speakers, each speech followed by a three-minute period for questions and comments.

*[English]*

In other words, I will give the floor to three Liberal speakers and between each speech there will be three minutes for questions and comments period.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Algoma for seven minutes.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House today is perhaps one of the most important motions, and this debate is the most important before the House this spring for some 36,000 dairy, poultry and egg producers across Canada.

The motion itself speaks about the maintenance of the supply management system, the arrangements for import controls, retaining the Crow benefit, reducing export subsidies for our grain and oilseed producers in the international marketplace, and the need for impact statements.