

### Supply

GATT negotiations which are going into the last eight crucial weeks.

I really am amazed at the minister's amendment because he proposes in paragraph (e) that economic impact studies will be provided at the request of the affected industry. We were told this morning by Waldie Klassen of the Canadian Chicken Marketing Agency that their industry had asked for such an economic impact study and the government had not provided it. So I would be interested to know why the government is refusing to provide that to the Canadian Chicken Marketing Agency when it is putting in its motion now, the amendment, that it will provide it.

In the second part of that same paragraph (e), the amendment is removing the provision that economic impact studies be provided to national legislatures. What is going on here? The government is always talking about freedom of information, yet it is removing from the motion before the House today that members of Parliament be provided with those critical studies.

If we are going to support the government in any agreement it reaches at the GATT, we have to know what we are voting on. I am just dumbfounded that the government would put down an amendment which would provide economic impact studies which it refused to provide to the Canadian Chicken Marketing Agency and, I assume, to other groups. At the same time, it is removing the provision in the original motion that this information be provided to members of Parliament. Surely that is totally unreasonable.

I would like to ask the minister why the government has refused that information to the Canadian Chicken Marketing Agency and why it is proposing in this motion to remove the provision of providing these economic impact studies of, in this case, the Dunkel proposals, to members of Parliament.

**Mr. McKnight:** I would like to address my hon. colleague's last question. The amendment says "in co-operation with the industries affected". He will know that on January 9, some time after the Dunkel text had been delivered, which is a basis of negotiation, I contacted the heads of the supply management agencies, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and my provincial colleagues, the ministers of agriculture and said to them

now that we have this text, it is difficult to argue against what is in something unless you know what it contains.

Up until that point, we had never done an analysis of the tariff numbers. We tabled, as other countries did in 1990, some numbers, but they certainly were not the numbers that were put forward out of the Dunkel text. I said we would now like to look at the text and see what numbers come out of that text. We would provide the numbers to the agencies and then ask the agencies: "Are these the numbers as you interpret the Dunkel text?"

• (1610)

As soon as we did that, members in some political parties and some of the supply management agencies said: "Oh, the government is looking at tariffication because they have taken the numbers from the text." It is important to understand that we did not argue on numbers because we did not have tariffication as a government position. We do not today. What we did was argue for strengthening and clarification. You cannot argue for strengthening and clarification and then say: "What about the numbers?", so we did not until we had the authority of the agencies.

I still have not received, and neither have my officials, confirmation from any of the agencies that those numbers are the numbers that are found in the Dunkel text. No one has worked with us to say that these are the numbers that we find in the text.

It appears that some members in the supply management economy are saying that because we gave them numbers after we asked for authorization, that we have changed our position. We will not be doing impact assessments unless we are directly requested to do so by the supply management agencies. We should do them co-operatively, share our knowledge and our information because to do it independently would leave out an important partner.

That is the answer to the hon. member's question as to why we put forward the amendment.

The other point that I think has to be understood is that we sat down some two years ago and designed the position that Canada has presented and continues to defend and present. It was designed with the industry and will continue to be the position put forward by Canada, and the attempt to attract support will continue and for that we need the support of the industry.