

Customs Tariff

do we underline some of them and why do we not underline others? Why is "rate" underlined? Is that a new item?

Now we go on to some of the clauses under proposed section 15, and *ad valorem*—I suppose that means value, does it? They cannot even write the damn thing in English. It is not even in French. It is written in another foreign language. Whatever it means it says *ad valorem*. It says here: "rate of duty provided for in tariff items 8718"—they are not in the list—and it carries on to say "shall apply in lieu of the free rate of duty."

Proposed subsection (c) reads:

(c) that the specific rate of duty, or *ad valorem* minimum rate of duty, as the case may be, provided for in tariff items 10 8702-1, 8705-1, 8708-1, 8712-1, 8720-2, 8724-1, 9203-1, 9205-1, 9206-1, and 9211-1 shall apply in lieu of the free rate of duty,

There is an indication that subsection (c) is a substituted section and I would like to know for what it is substituted. Is the underlining showing the changes that were made?

I know this has been translated into the second language, whichever way that is, but we always have room on the other page to put the explanation of what we did. We are not doing that. It seems to me that we can pass this if we want, but we will not have understood it or have done much about it if we do. We are not sure whether it is good or bad. I am not sure. But I am sure that some of these changes must mean something. It does not mean that we have had people in Geneva negotiating GATT agreements, in many cases getting the worst of it for several years. Yet we are going to come up with a total change in our tariff and Customs structure that is obviously not going to be good for everybody. It will be worse for some and better for others. I would like to know first who it will be good for and who it will be bad for: Those things that are good for the people that I represent, I will vote for. But I would have to look seriously at the ones being taken away.

We are all Canadians, but we differ in some respects. Some people depend on agriculture, some on natural resources, and some on manufacturing for their livelihood. I would imagine each of these tariff items will affect something. I would like to know what they are. I do not imagine that when I sit down the parliamentary secretary will tell me what they are. I know that I can look back. But let us take a look at No. 8702-2. This is in schedule I at page eight of Bill C-18. This concerns asparagus processing. My friend knows all about this one, he knows that number off by heart. It says that if it is British Preferential Tariff—and I do not know whether we get asparagus from Great Britain, I would doubt it but maybe we do—asparagus can come in free. On what is it free? What does this mean? Is it free on two cases of asparagus? I do not know. But we are not buying any asparagus. If we get it from the most favoured nation, we will pay 3½ cents but not less than 10 per cent, or free. That is nice, but what does it mean? It is not going to be less than 10 per cent, or free. What does it mean?

It does not mean anything to me. It is going to be 3½ cents but not less than 10 per cent. I do not think I can get any asparagus for three cents. Now, if we buy it under "general

[Mr. Peters.]

tariff" it says 3½ cents but not less than 10 per cent, or free. That has not told me anything. Has it told hon. members anything? Has that told us what it was before? Does it tell us where it was moved from? How do we modify it? To what extent will it apply? However, it does say: "In any 12 month period ending 31st March, the specific duty or *ad valorem* duty, as the case may be, shall not be maintained in force in excess of 8 weeks, and the Free rate shall apply whenever the specific duty or *ad valorem* duty is not in effect." What does that tell me? I suppose if I were in the business it would tell me something about it.

I listened with great interest to what the former minister said. He said it would be triggered by the horticultural society. Then he was a little indefinite as to how they were doing it. I may have got confused by him saying that in some cases it took three weeks to make the kind of order they were going to trigger.

It is all very well, but I suppose there is some reason why we made this change. I do not see why we should pass all these numbers. The hon. member may know, but we are not supposed to be flipping to the schedule and the annexe until we come to them. We are supposed to follow some order, confusing and unenlightening as it may be. Before we pass these items we would like to know whether there was any increase or a decrease.

What was the most favoured nation tariff last year? Was it two cents or five cents? I do not know whether or not it was raised. It does not even say plus or minus. It does not say it was increased or decreased. There are some very serious omissions in the way we are presenting these Custom tariff amendments, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to call it ten o'clock so the department can think about these things and perhaps supply some additional information.

Progress reported.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

SOCIAL SECURITY—REQUEST THAT PRINCIPLE OF
UNIVERSALITY OF FAMILY ALLOWANCES BE MAINTAINED

Hon. Monique Bégin (Saint-Léonard-Anjou): On October 24 last, Mr. Speaker, I put to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Crombie) a simple and direct question, to wit whether he was in favour of universal family allowances. As it has been customary for Progressive Conservative ministers