

These dealt with market access, internal support and export competition in the context of a balanced multilateral trade agreement. We did not offer any tariff equivalents for supply management of products because—and this is the answer to the honourable senators question—our position continues to be that we wish to see these products governed by import quotas under a clarified and strengthened GATT Article XI.

● (1450)

**Senator Olson:** Honourable senators, I am not suggesting that there is anything scandalous about the heads of state of Germany and of the United States having a meeting. It is what they are having the meeting about that is important. I wish the honourable minister would not try to hedge on the question I asked. They have announced that they will be discussing the matters that have led to the impasse of the GATT negotiations that have been going on now for nearly five years. These are matters that are vitally important to Canada and to a number of other nations, and those nations concerned will not even be represented when these discussions are taking place and perhaps decisions are being made. Is that the way Canada is to be run?

**Senator Murray:** Again, honourable senators, I hope Chancellor Kohl and President Bush do discuss the impasse in the GATT negotiations, particularly with regard to agriculture, and I hope they make progress on that matter. It is no secret that there is a very sharp difference of opinion, especially on agriculture, as between the United States on the one hand and the European Economic Community on the other.

If those two leaders, President Bush of the United States and Chancellor Kohl of Germany—which is a major player in the EEC—can make some progress then the world, including Canada, will be the better for it because we have an enormous stake in trade liberalization and a successful Uruguay Round.

**Senator Olson:** That means that Canada's new position is that we will leave these vital negotiations to someone else to settle for us at a time when we will not even be at the table. If that is the policy of the government, which seems to be the implication that the minister is leaving with us, that is fine. I think the producers in Canada will be interested to know that that is so.

If that then is the case, can we also take it that, because of some of the opinions that have been expressed by these two leaders from time to time, or at least by the spokesmen in the negotiations for their two countries, that their wishes and views will take effect, or come to pass, namely, those relating to Article XI and the sacrifices that may have to be made in the adjustment for the sake of other trade factors. Will these items also be in the package?

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, we Canadians who engage in a great many bilateral discussions with our trade partners relating to the multilateral negotiations can hardly object or quibble if two other countries—any two other countries—choose to sit down and discuss these matters. Again, there is nothing unusual in the fact that the Chancellor of Germany and the President of the United States should meet,

and certainly it should surprise no one that at or near the top of their agenda should be a discussion of the multilateral trade negotiations, the Uruguay Round, the successful outcome of which is of such great importance to us and to the world.

**Senator Olson:** Honourable senators, if I ever heard a cop out, this is it.

## WESTERN SAHARA

### IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED PEACE PLAN—CANADIAN PARTICIPATION—REQUEST FOR UPDATE

**Hon. Lorna Marsden:** Honourable senators, perhaps I may bring the questions back to the Western Sahara. I asked a question on November 19 on the implementation of the proposed peace plan and Canadian participation. The response came on December 10 when the minister answered my questions about the presence of Canadian observers in MINURSO, which is the U.N. Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara. I asked about the press and the conditions in the refugee camps and I warned the minister that I would continue to follow this question.

Again in early February I gave notice to the minister then asked a question about the peace plan in the Western Sahara, and the minister replied that we have 36 military personnel monitoring the ceasefire with the U.N. mission, including the military commander who is a Canadian. Honourable senators will find these responses on pages 742 and 901 of *Debates of the Senate*.

Honourable senators, those questions were asked in February. Through my own initiative I have now received a report from the Office of the Secretary-General MINURSO and, more particularly, a report from the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations dated January 1992, a staff report on the Western Sahara. I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the findings of this U.S. Senate Committee. They have defined some difficulties, and I will give a couple of examples:

The U.N. Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) peacekeeping force has been severely hampered by a lack of assistance and political support from the United Nations hierarchy in New York. The lack of assistance is demonstrated by the United Nations' repeated refusal to provide even limited logistical support to the U.N. Military Observers in the field. As a result, the Observers are forced to assume an overwhelming load of logistical and administrative duties, which prevents them from carrying out their peacekeeping duties.

The United Nations' refusal to respond politically to MINURSO's reports of ceasefire violations in the Western Sahara has undermined MINURSO's credibility with both parties.

I am abbreviating this. However, here is a more crucial one that the minister may be interested in: