

*Adjournment Debate*

**Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that what I am about to say will satisfy the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). He has already qualified what I am going to say as being bunk.

Let me try to situate the hon. member in a proper context. I think he is showing a lot of disrespect for all the members of the Public Accounts Committee. I wish that if he had the time he would come to see what takes place in that committee before criticizing and characterizing what I have to say as bunk. Members of his own party, and of all parties, have spent many hours conscientiously engaged in this work. I should like him to have been present this morning when a code of ethics was supplied to us following questions asked by various members present.

The hon. member complains that the government has been restrictive. He says the tactics it has been using have been restrictive. I doubt very much that he has taken the time to read the minutes of the committee.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Every word.

**Mr. Trudel:** The question whether the committee has received some of the documents it was seeking should be examined very closely. I think we have been supplied with documents, in some cases with too many documents. We have asked to see certain contracts which are confidential in nature. We have asked the Auditor General. I think the hon. member has shown little respect for the Auditor General in his remarks because he has been co-operating and has been instrumental in helping the work of the committee, not hindering it. All the members have been co-operating and have been seeking some information. There is a report to be submitted to the committee, and I am sure there is frustration on all sides as to certain aspects of the work we are doing presently.

There is one aspect with which the hon. member is concerned. He is seeking to change some of the work which is being done. I will fully co-operate and I hope that all of us will achieve what he is seeking. The fact is that we can proceed in camera at the present time. It has not been done so far, but I am sure we will be doing so in the near future at the call of the Chair, whenever he asks us. The steering committee, as I said, has considered that. We will have to put before the House a report.

This is a very extensive study which has been placed before us. We have encountered evidence that there need to be changes in the rules. I feel there has been no hindrance by any member either of the cabinet or of any party at the present time, so I do not know what the hon. member calls "bunk", but I do feel that the chairman and the committee members have co-operated to get what we are seeking at the present time.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

TRADE—GUIDELINES TO COMPANIES WITH REGARD TO  
INTERNATIONAL BOYCOTTS—REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, on October 21 last year, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) made a statement on the government's policy on international boycotts. It read in part as follows:

The government will take measures to deny its support or facilities for various kinds of trade transactions in order to combat any discriminatory effects which such boycotts may have on Canadian firms and individuals . . .

Canadian firms may decide nonetheless to agree to certain boycott clauses and forego Canadian government support for the projects concerned. All Canadian firms, however, whether they accept boycott clauses or not, will be required to report all instances of their complying with boycott provisions. Information obtained from such reports will be made available to the public.

The two measures that the minister said the government would take to implement this policy did not go into effect on October 21; instead it was three months later, on January 21 of this year, that the deputy minister of industry, trade and commerce finally issued guidelines to his departmental officials for their implementation. From a reading of these guidelines, however, it would not appear that the government has done what it promised to do in its October 21 statement. That statement clearly says that all Canadian firms will be required to report all instances of their compliance with boycott provisions. But the guidelines say that only those firms that "request" departmental support for transactions "where boycott requests have been agreed to" will be reported.

Firms will surely know, Mr. Speaker, that they will not get support for such transactions, and they will not request such assistance in the first place. So, as a practical matter, the reporting system set out in the guidelines has no real meaning or substance. What is disturbing is that it would appear that through these guidelines the government has modified, has backed away from, the commitment that it made in its October 21 statement. That statement said all firms, not just those that approach the department and request its help, would be required to report boycott related transactions.

The guidelines appear to narrow down, to draw back from, what most observers thought the government was promising in its October 21 statement in another significant way. They say that government supporting services will be denied only where boycott clauses "have been agreed to". But most government supporting services in the trade area are provided before agreements are made. What the guidelines are saying, therefore, is that, in spite of the government's statement of last October 21, the government will be providing most of its services as before. It will be circulating trade opportunity information requiring boycott compliance. It will provide market information, promotional services, all of the facilities of its trade commissioners, until a contract with a boycott clause is finally signed and agreed to.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, very few of these kinds of government support services come after an agreement has been signed. There is no need for them after that point. This is not what the public thought the government was going to do. The words of the statement last October 21 create the impression that these services would be withheld for activities leading up to the