

*Government Orders*

I have the feeling that Motion No. 4 goes somewhat along the same lines, yet has a much narrower scope than Motion No. 2 that we presented this morning. Motion No. 4 stresses the importance of parliamentary review and, in that sense, I think that we can support, endorse this position, although, as I said earlier, the motion we tabled this morning, on which recorded division will be taken later on, has a much broader scope, while at the same time addressing our colleagues' concerns, concerns that are evident from Motion No. 4.

Let me remind you that—and I think it is important to mention this, for the benefit of our colleagues from the government party of course, who gave us the impression this morning of being opposed our motion to amend No. 2—it is important to bear in mind that Motion No. 2 which we presented this morning had been suggested to us by the Union des producteurs agricoles and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture at one of the public hearings held by the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Both organizations testified before the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade to ask that Bill C-57 include a provision requiring that a report be tabled each year on the implementation of the agreement in Canada, of course, but also by our major trading partners. Such a provision was part of the proposal we put forth this morning.

Despite the expectations expressed by the Quebec farmers' union and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the government party apparently decided to oppose this proposed amendment. I therefore urge our colleagues from the New Democratic Party to strongly support this proposed amendment, which is consistent with what they are proposing in Motion No. 4 but whose scope is much broader.

As for Motion No. 5, which is aimed at ensuring in a way that the World Trade Organization operates in an open manner and that the Canadian government publishes studies on the implementation of the agreement, we always come back to this aspect of the problem: we think that Canada does not have to conform to provisions 12.1 (a) through (d). In our opinion, Canada must insist that the World Trade Organization should produce a comprehensive and relevant annual report.

However—this is always a problem we have with the broad motions proposed by our colleagues from the New Democratic Party since this morning—we clearly are in complete agreement with some of the paragraphs, namely (e), (f) and (g).

● (1325)

These paragraphs provide for consultations with the provinces provisions, under the Agreement, that affect areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. It is very important to point out that the federal government, which claims to believe in co-operative federalism, must not hesitate to include in the

agreement specific provisions calling for consultations with the provinces on issues of particular interest to them.

The parliamentary secretary said earlier: Yes, but we did consult with the provinces. If so, why are they so reluctant to put in the bill a provision specifically requiring such consultation with the provinces? In no way would it make the process more cumbersome. Despite what he said, it would not give the provinces a veto. It would simply give the provinces an opportunity to convey their concerns to the federal government on issues that concern them. I think that is quite legitimate.

That being said, of course paragraphs (e), (f) and (g) of Motion No. 5 now before us refer to this taking into consideration of provincial jurisdiction and of particular concerns of the provinces.

If these paragraphs were separate from the rest of the amendment, we could vote for such an amendment, but given paragraphs 12.1(a) to (d), which we believe are wrong for Canada, we must oppose this amendment, again, with regret.

As for 12.1(h), we find it totally unacceptable because we do not really see how it could be applied right now.

I think that it is also important to say something about clause 12.2. Of course, we agree with the principle behind this clause, namely periodic review, but that being said, we would not want people to think that we on this side of the House have cold feet or are afraid of international trade agreements. For this reason, we could not legitimately give our full and complete support to that clause.

In view of what I just said, and although we could very well have agreed to paragraphs 12.1(e), (f) and (g) without any problem, we must oppose this amendment.

[English]

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to Motion No. 4.

Why single out milk marketing? Dozens if not hundreds of industry groups would like to have government fund their studies. In fact we are dealing with Motion No. 5 here as well as the two tie together.

Motion No. 5 asks for an annual report from the World Trade Organization. Those reports already exist under GATT. In a moment I want to read an article in today's *Globe and Mail* that deals specifically with the biannual reports from the GATT.

These reports exist. The minister can be asked to table them in the House. Why cause extra work? It is more bureaucracy. It is something that the NDP sort of like, I understand.

I want to read a quote from today's *Globe and Mail* regarding Canada's involvement in the GATT. It states: "Canada's trade policy and practices receive generally high marks from the members at the GATT council during a two day discussion of a biannual report but the council criticized Canada's tariff system and interprovincial trade barriers".