

Two recent developments have cast doubts on the successful completion of the GATT Uruguay Round. The European Community refuses to lower its massive agricultural subsidies. More recently, the United States has said that with regard to trade in services it prefers to deal outside the GATT.

Will the minister tell the House whether these two developments are linked? Is the Canadian government seeking to encourage concessions from the European Community in agriculture in return for U.S. concessions on trade in services?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we have a serious question at least at the end of Question Period.

The position is that these developments are not linked. As the Cairns Group has made clear again today in a statement just issued in Europe, in Geneva, the European Community offer on agriculture is unacceptable as an outcome of the round.

It has offered only modest and ill-defined reductions in internal subsidies by 1996, from what is an historically high base in 1986. Those reductions would not apply equally across agricultural products.

It is not offering substantial reductions in border protection, nor assured increases in market access. In fact it is seeking increased protection in some levels. Nor is it offering any specific commitments to cut its export subsidies which are today ravaging agricultural markets. Therefore the present European Community offer is not a satisfactory basis for negotiation.

With respect to services, there will be no agreement in services unless the United States proves itself to be more flexible in the services negotiation, but a good result there will be very helpful for all countries, certainly including Canada.

\* \* \*

#### POINT OF ORDER

##### CORRECTION OF ANSWER

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make a correction to an answer that I gave to a question earlier in Question Period.

In the answer in respect of the change in the tax system across the country from the federal sales tax to

the GST, particularly as it relates to the province of Nova Scotia, I pointed out that there would be a savings of \$10 billion to the people of Nova Scotia. In fact I meant to say it would be a savings of \$10 million.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

##### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** As is customary, Madam Speaker, I should like to ask the Government House Leader as I do every Thursday what legislation he intends to call for consideration by the House over the next few days, namely, Friday, Monday and Tuesday.

While I am on my feet, Madam Speaker—

[*English*]

Given the announcement that the Supplementary Estimates will be tabled tomorrow by the President of the Treasury Board and given that these estimates will be tabled at twelve o'clock, in the interest of open government and in the interest of accountable government, especially, I wonder if we could find, Madam Speaker, unanimous consent to have those estimates tabled at ten o'clock when the House resumes tomorrow morning, instead of at twelve o'clock after Question Period, so that the opposition may have a chance to look at those estimates and maybe question the government on them.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, in answer to the first question, tomorrow it is my intention to call Bill C-92, having to do with Northwest Territories laws. Hopefully we can pass that in three stages. I understand there is some acceptability to that suggestion on all sides.

On Monday I would propose to call Bill C-91, Financial Administration Act amendments. Perhaps we could finish second reading debate on that.

On Tuesday I would like to continue report stage of Bill C-40, respecting the Broadcasting Act.

I will be discussing with my colleagues in the opposition parties further business for Wednesday and the rest of next week.