

Export Development Act

number of non-tariff barriers and we must find ways to eliminate them. The climate of international negotiation does not seem to lend itself at the moment to another great Kennedy-like round of tariff negotiations. There is no reason why we cannot be negotiating a number of lesser agreements to remove some of the 800 non-tariff barriers under GATT that bother us today.

Many of these non-tariff barriers are of minor consequence, and if Canadian businessmen or members of this House are cognizant of specific items they feel can be removed and are bothersome to Canadian business, we would be very glad to hear from them. This government stands ready to negotiate at every possible level and is most anxious to develop the freest possible kind of trade in order to improve our trading position wherever possible in the face of the complications in the world.

This concludes my remarks on the bill. I look forward to our discussions in committee and to suggestions to be made by hon. members at that time.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, would the Parliamentary Secretary answer a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Baldwin: I should like to ask the hon. member a question on the last point I raised. The Parliamentary Secretary dealt with the difference between "negotiable instrument" and "instrument". As the Parliamentary Secretary knows, under the act an instrument includes a negotiable instrument and also simple evidence of indebtedness. Having in mind the change in terminology, it would now appear there will be an opportunity for the corporation to negotiate, sell or deal with an instrument, which includes only evidence of indebtedness. Can the Parliamentary Secretary assure the House that the corporation is satisfied that simple evidence of indebtedness as defined by the act, which is now included by the elimination of the word "negotiable", can in fact be dealt with by the corporation as in the past? There is a difference between a negotiable instrument as we understand it in this country and evidence of indebtedness which might be given according to the law of a foreign country but which might not be acceptable here.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan-Boundary): If the hon. member is referring to evidence of indebtedness as being a promissory note, then this is clearly a negotiable instrument. The difficulty arises in that it is now common banking practice in international trade to have a fixed interest rate included in the instrument. Because of this kind of change it is necessary to remove the word "negotiable". This is purely a technical change to accommodate the differences in common usage that have grown up in recent years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

[Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary).]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

* * *

NEW ZEALAND TRADE AGREEMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT

PROVISION FOR APPROVAL AND COMING INTO FORCE

Hon. Ron Basford (for the Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved that Bill S-4, to implement an agreement amending the trade agreement between Canada and New Zealand, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding the motion to refer this bill to committee. I wonder why on earth it was found necessary that a trade agreement which deals primarily with dumping and anti-dumping negotiation should be referred to the committee on external affairs, when the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs is the committee which has dealt in great detail with the question of dumping and anti-dumping and all that flows therefrom. It seems to me that the motion should refer the matter to the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. I hope that someone on the government side who is in a position to move an amendment to the motion will consider my suggestion and move such an amendment.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Protocol modifying the 1932 Trade Agreement between Canada and New Zealand was signed in Wellington on May 13, 1970, by the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) and by the Prime Minister of New Zealand.

Although the protocol does not modify the essence of the rules governing our bilateral exchanges, it constitutes an updating of the existing agreement and provides for certain mutual benefits.

First, a new anti-dumping provision enables Canada to fulfill her obligations under the international anti-dumping code while providing for similar treatment for Canadian goods on the part of New Zealand authorities.

Second, under an amendment included in the protocol, Canada pledges to try, by means of administrative measures, to minimize the difficulties encountered by New Zealand exporters due to certain requirements of the Agreement compelling them to ship their goods directly to Canada in order to enjoy the British preferential tariff.

Third, this new clause covering specifically consultations and the establishment of a joint consultative Canada-New Zealand committee provides means and ways to