

system, whose chief justice and attorney general were both Tamils (*The Citizen*, September 23).

The *Globe and Mail* reported on September 23 that the ombudsman for the Sri Lankan government, Sam Wijesinha, had said that he had never received a human rights complaint in five years in the post. The same report said that the Sri Lankan High Commission had released an unsigned statement accusing Mr. Pararajasegaran of being a terrorist and a thief who was part of "a separatist network" trying to destabilize the Sri Lankan government. Mr. Pararajasegaran denied that he was a terrorist or had committed any crimes, the report said.

On September 23, two Sri Lankan Cabinet Ministers issued statements. One threatened reprisals against Canadian diplomats if Ottawa pursued inquiries into the record of the Sri Lankan High Commissioner, while the other called for the extradition of Mr. Pararajasegaran to Colombo. External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said that while there might be allegations of something dark in the past of

General Weeratunga, there were not enough "true facts" to justify Canadian action against him at that point. Mr. Clark said that Canadian officials were making cautious inquiries into the torture allegations, that some of the facts were being disputed by the Sri Lankan government, and that efforts were being made to separate the wheat from the chaff. General Weeratunga, meanwhile, said that Mr. Pararajasegaran was wanted in Sri Lanka on suspicion of murder. Department of External Affairs spokesmen said, however, that no extradition treaty existed between Canada and Sri Lanka, and Canada was therefore under no obligation to cooperate with the extradition request (*Globe and Mail*, September 24).

*The Citizen* reported on September 24 that a Sri Lankan government spokesman in Colombo had said that his government was seeking the extradition of Mr. Pararajasegaran at that time because it had not known his whereabouts until he had begun making allegations against General Weeratunga.

## Multilateral Relations

### GATT

#### **Punta Del Este**

From September 15 to 20 in Punta del Este, Uruguay, the ninety-two member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) met to decide the agenda for the next round of GATT talks, the "Uruguay Round," expected to last four years.

During a visit to Venezuela before the start of the GATT meeting, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said on September 8, "We fear and will fight isolationism, protectionism and predatory subsidization schemes. . . . Our main objective in Punta del Este will be to reduce the strains on the system which, if not relieved, will have a disastrous impact on our collective future" (*Globe and Mail*, September 9). The Minister proposed the formation of "a small group of respected persons from a handful of countries" to find "short-term, emergency solutions to the grain dispute that is increasingly dividing major trading powers," a group that Mr. Clark said would be able to act more quickly than the GATT in seeking definitions of subsidies and ways of rolling them back (*The Citizen*, September 10).

In Punta del Este just prior to the conference, the Minister met with the conference chairman, Uruguayan Foreign Minister Enrique Iglesias, to discuss ways of defusing the potentially contentious issues of trade in services and agricultural subsidies, which were not included in the last GATT round (*Globe and Mail*, September 15).

In his opening address to the Punta del Este conference, Mr. Clark urged delegates to fight the erection of barriers to global commerce. The Minister said that every country shared the blame for protectionism, and stressed the need for talks on agriculture to begin before the end of the year. Thomas Hockin, Minister of State for Finance, said on the first day of the meeting, "We want a more orderly environment in terms of prices for grains. . . . We're not saying we would have a bigger share of markets, but we should have a better idea of what to expect" (*Globe and Mail*, September 16). A draft declaration signed by fifty GATT members, including Canada, the US and members of the European Community (EC), proposed that agricultural subsidy reduction and trade in services both be included in the Uruguay Round. Opposition to the declaration was expected from the French delegates, who had not yet arrived at Punta del Este.

The conference moved closer to an agreement on September 18 when France abandoned its long opposition to discussing the reduction of agricultural subsidies. The EC presented a proposal, agreed to by France, whereunder Europe would accept the draft guidelines to the Uruguay Round talks, provided the clause "the elimination of food subsidies would be considered" were deleted, and replaced by a clause saying that the talks would try to "reduce negative effects of food subsidies" (*Globe and Mail*, September 19).