

*Government Orders*

was prepared to show to us during the course of the committee's hearings.

For protection abroad for commercial purposes of Canadian plant varieties, we have no baseline study to know now what our penetration of the foreign markets are, so how are we going to measure whether it has been improved or diminished?

The fourth point that the government is prepared to support is with regard to whether there would be an improvement of plant varieties to the public benefit, particularly to the benefit of farmers and nurserymen. We may be able to go backward, find what varieties are in existence now, and set up a system to provide that kind of monitoring and measuring. To my knowledge, and from listening to the witnesses we had before the committee, that system is not in very good shape, if it exists at all.

Therefore, on all these items, the minister's Parliamentary Secretary is correct when he said that it was going to be difficult to make a measurement. I do not see how that can justify the government's to not support the three additional points. The whole area is rather fuzzy, but these are all questions that should be looked at.

It is not going to be easy to make the assessment that Section 77 calls for in the review procedure, but it does give some guidelines. I think that the additional guidelines that have been proposed by the member for Algoma do not conflict with the four already required by the Act which have the government's support.

If it is impossible to make the measurement in the 10-year review, the review panel can simply say it was impossible and explain why. It may find that it has to do this on all four items that the government is now prepared to support, too. But it will be able to give the Parliament of the day, farmers, plant breeders, and consumers in the country some idea of the direction in which the country has shifted because of the introduction of this legislation. I am presuming that the government majority will hold to the end of third reading and that it will pass at this stage, even though I think that is a questionable call and that this is not in the best interests of the country.

In conclusion, I would call on government members and, particularly, the Parliamentary Secretary to the

Minister of Agriculture to review his analysis of these three points in light of the four that he is already prepared to support. I reiterate that the problems that he has with the three that are being proposed by my friend from Algoma are very similar to the problems that he should have with the four he is willing to accept. Since it is all going to be very difficult to measure, I think he would be well disposed to accept the other three and let us have as broad a review as is possible ten years' hence.

• (1020 )

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this opportunity to put on record the concerns that many people from Victoria have expressed to me about this bill.

It is a bill which has not received the attention across the country that it might deserve. Perhaps the title is one that distracts people to believing that it is a very specialized bill. But it is one which many of my constituents feel has grave implications for Canadians, particularly at this time of concern for the environment.

The bill is seen, and in my view quite correctly, as a bill which denies the right to choose the foods and plants which we grow and consume. The bill has not had the discussion across the country that it ought to have. The amendments which have been proposed by my colleagues in the New Democratic Party will go a long way to deal with those concerns.

These amendments include a fee which should be remitted to the international board for plant genetic resources that could be used to convert and develop plant varieties and genetic resources around the world. This would ensure that the commissioner consults with the advisory committee composed of breeders, seed dealers, farmers, and the general public, and that reports would be produced. At the very least, Canadians must be kept informed as to the implications and development of this bill.

At this stage, the government seems determined to put it through. I would hope, however, that it would give very careful consideration to the various amendments, particularly the one that is before the House at this point and that it would listen to the very wise words of the member who has spoken and addressed the House on this issue on our behalf.