

*Oral Questions*

As I have said before, what is it that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is going to renegotiate? If you are going to renegotiate you have to give to get. The Americans are looking to see some changes in the supply management system. They are looking for changes in the cultural exemption which we have negotiated.

Which of these is my hon. friend willing to give up, because he has to give if he is going to get.

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, the United States, as the minister knows, does not hesitate to put forward its values and its ideas in parallel accords.

The three parallel accords to which the minister has referred may not alter the NAFTA text itself but will certainly change the way in which the NAFTA agreement will operate.

Will the Canadian government, not the U.S. government, for its part take this opportunity to propose a parallel accord on subsidies and anti-dumping so as to protect Canadian interests and to prevent the sort of trade harassment that we have suffered from the United States in recent months?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, let me take my hon. friend back to February of a year ago when it was the Canadian government in the negotiations in Montreal that put forward some specific proposals for trilateral agreements on labour and on the environment. It was the Canadian government that put these forward.

We were not able to get agreement from the other parties at that time, but now that the Americans are coming back and looking more productively at this, it has given us a new opportunity to carry forward the proposals we put forward a year ago.

My hon. friend is asking about the countervail and anti-dumping elements. He knows we have a very good proposal on the table right now in the Uruguay round. I know that he and I are both in agreement in hoping that we will see some successful conclusion of this in a very

short period of time. That I think will provide the answers he is looking for.

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, the best way for the government to proceed would be to embody the GATT text on subsidies in the North American free trade agreement.

The minister knows that it was his government which took the intellectual property provisions and particularly the drug patent requirements out of the Uruguay round text and put them in the NAFTA.

If that is good policy, why is it not equally good policy for the government to take the subsidies text out of the GATT and put it in the North American free trade agreement, either in the text itself or in a parallel accord?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, in a perfect world I would be inclined to agree with my friend. However, you have to get agreement from the other two parties. The other two parties are saying: "Let us complete it in the Uruguay round". On that basis what is included in the Uruguay round will be included as part of the disciplines the North American free trade partners must follow as well. That is the approach we have decided to follow.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, we know where the Conservatives stand on the NAFTA. It would really be helpful to the debate if we found out where the Liberals stood on the NAFTA.

My question is directed to the Minister of Finance who will know—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** No one cares where you stand. You are irrelevant.

**Mr. Riis:** They seem a little bit irritated. I wonder why.

The minister will remember back in 1972 when he sat on this side the Liberal government brought in the family trust loophole to the tax system. He will remember days and days of railing on against this unfair provision.