## Oral Questions

the bankability and the certainty and comfort that the GRIP program of 1991 gave them.

\* \*

## TRADE

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Earlier today the Minister for International Trade, in response to a question from a colleague from the Liberal Party regarding the beer wars and GATT, reiterated the government's position that it supported the process of GATT and would comply through GATT's requirements.

On March 27, 1992 the minister received a letter from Mr. Howard Collins, acting general manager of the Brewers Association of Canada, asking the minister to support the brewers' contention that GATT's rulings against the Americans had not been pressed by the Canadian government.

Could the minister inform the House why he is agreeing under a GATT ruling to go along with the American demands while at the same time a GATT report examining U.S. federal state measures affecting beer and wine found that over 60 measures in 39 states were violating GATT regulations?

Why give in to the Americans on one and let them get away with their own violations on another?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada brought that action against the Americans before the GATT. The GATT has not formally reported on it. That report will come on Thursday. At that time we will take every action necessary to enforce the rulings of the GATT if it found those rulings in our favour.

Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Mr. Speaker, GATT has found the violations in the U.S. state laws. GATT has also indicated that in some cases there are direct financial benefits. In the case of New York, \$651,000 savings per brewer because of tax benefits; Ohio had savings of \$1.5 million annually; Kentucky, \$375,000; Rhode Island, \$300,000; and Minnesota, \$115,000. The list goes on and on.

Why have we caved in to the demands of the United States on GATT and not insisted that the same respect for GATT be given by the Americans? This is already known. We do not have to wait until Thursday.

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend holds the GATT up on a pedestal and says we must respect the GATT. The GATT has not officially reported.

What my hon. friend is referring to is what is in the public domain according to rumours flowing from the expected GATT decision that will be reported on Thursday.

Mr. Barrett: Oh, oh.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** Perhaps the hon. member would let me complete my answer. If the GATT officially reports on Thursday consistent with the reports that my hon. friend is hearing in the news these days that he has just talked to, my hon. friend can be assured that we are going to take every action possible to ensure that the Americans comply with the rulings of GATT.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton-Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister of Canada.

The attack on the Iranian embassy more than three weeks ago is an embarrassment to Canadian security. According to the recommendations of the committee reviewing the act establishing the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Solicitor General should play a key role in anti-terrorist activities.

I want to know what the minister has done to explain this failure of the security service to the Canadian people.

## [English]

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will be aware that the Solicitor General is out of the House today. He will be back on Wednesday.

As I indicated the last occasion on which the hon. member raised such a question, the Security Intelligence Review Committee is looking into this matter and will be making a report. If the hon. member has any information he believes they should have, he should turn it over to them.