

Supply

With respect to the question of clarification, that is a concept that needs examination and careful analysis. We are not going to reject it out of hand. This is the end of October 1989. The negotiations are going forward over the next 12 months before they are concluded. It is a concept that has to be examined.

Trying to get the costs of non-tariff barriers by applying the principle of clarification can be useful. Aggregate measure of support is a very useful concept. It is a complicated, involved, and intricate process. There has been no agreement yet by all sides on what is an AMS, an adequate measure of support. That is a concept that certainly has to be pursued so that everyone can see just what it costs them to give in certain areas and just what they may gain in other areas. These are useful tools, but all they are are tools.

With respect to the laws of subsidy and countervail, Canada has made a submission to the GATT and on all hands this has received considerable support. I hope the hon. gentleman has read it. It is going to be used, I think, as the document for negotiation with respect to subsidy and countervail. If that paper is accepted in the course of these negotiations then the whole system will be that much further ahead and we will have a much more favourable, fair and sensible system with respect to what is legitimate and what is not with reference to subsidies and countervail.

• (1700)

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the minister, who spoke late in the day, when the sun was low, observed his own shadow and decided he was bigger than the rest who had spoken earlier. I notice that the minister has belatedly recognized that the U.S. Congress is never bound by international agreements. However, that is not what I really want to ask him.

As I noted in my speech, world situations change rather quickly in agriculture. I wonder if he could explain to us why Canada and other members of GATT have decided to proceed with these arrangements to try to solve for the next decade or so the agriculture and other trade related items without including the U.S.S.R. and China in the agreement. Both countries are showing signs of becoming very large agriculture producers. China has had a surplus for export two years out of the

last three years, at a time when the United States of America is no longer supplying its own needs and has been living off grains in storage for the last two crops.

Does the minister not think that any future GATT agreement with the existing members is almost doomed to failure, as the climate changes that appear to be taking place leave both the Soviet Union and China in a position of being exporters of grain and other basic commodities? How can we be in a position to attempt to resolve any trade disputes when we have left out two of the potentially largest producers of agriculture?

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, the People's Republic of China wishes to become a member of the GATT and there have been discussions in that connection going on for a number of months now. The U.S.S.R. is interested as well. These countries can only become part of the world trading system when they are prepared to accept the market system and the kind of international trade rules that apply to the world market system. Once they are ready to accept those rules then I have no doubt that they will be welcome.

It often puzzles me, Mr. Speaker, how it is that in Canada our socialists are so retrograde, so far behind their compatriots in New Zealand and Australia, countries which have discovered the market, like the East European socialists. The market has been discovered in Australia and it has been discovered in New Zealand by socialists, die-hard socialists. Yet, here in Canada we have a few Jim Crack socialists running across the country opposing anything to do with the market, which they say is heartless and so on. Here are their socialist compatriots, and the leader of the New Democratic Party is one of them, he is a vice-president, and they are going around the world saying the exact opposite. Talk about inconsistencies.

I might say that Mr. Jack Parnell, the U.S. Undersecretary of Agriculture was here today for discussions with our Deputy Minister of Agriculture and one of the issues we raised was Section 332, investigation of our Canadian durum exports to the United States. It is an investigation, of course, which in itself does not lead to any action being taken against us, but we do not like the suggestion that there is anything to investigate in the first place and that was a matter discussed with the U.S. undersecretary today.