

can he let the House adopt this Bill without discussing it further?

Mr. Garneau: Madam Speaker, you have here the example of an Hon. Member who is going to vote for the Bill without knowing what is in it. Because if we did not allow the House to adopt this Bill today, in view of the decisions which have already been made by this Government, the resulting chaos might be even worse, because there have already been commitments made by some corporations, and there has been all this publicity initiated by this Government that the Bill would start on June 30, and there would be no legislation. As there are now only 40 of us in the Opposition, even if we held a debate for three days or four nights, this Bill would be adopted just the same because the Conservatives are going to vote blindly for this Bill and the only thing we could do as the Opposition would be to add to the chaos that the Minister himself will be creating. It is therefore a matter of responsibility. If there had been only a couple of seats between us and the governing Party, I would certainly have started this debate and tried to convince two or three Conservative Members to vote against this Bill. But we have to accept the fact that although we may have all the right arguments, there are simply not enough of us. I do not want to create a greater chaos than the one which will exist beginning at midnight tonight.

• (1200)

[English]

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

CUSTOMS TARIFF AND DUTIES RELIEF ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Lewis: Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the Parties and I think you would find that on the next Bill to be dealt with, Bill C-69, there would be unanimous consent for the reference to be to Committee of the Whole House rather than to a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Is there such unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Finance)) moved that Bill C-69, an Act to amend the Customs Tariff and the Duties Relief Act, be read the second time and referred to Committee of the Whole.

He said: Madam Speaker, I have a few comments on the Bill and it should not take too long.

The Bill provides for four categories of tariff changes. The first involves those changes undertaken to reflect the changing needs of the private sector. An example is the duty-free entry being accorded mobile veterinarian clinics. These clinics are basically pick-up trucks with a box on the back outfitted for

veterinary purposes. They are not made in Canada and the Government received representations in favour of duty-free entry from the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association and numerous individual veterinarians, including I might add the five Members of this House who are also veterinarians. Removing the duty on the clinics will enable veterinarians to better serve their clientele.

[Translation]

The second type of tariff amendments contained in this Bill, Madam Speaker, are those which implement the recommendations of the Tariff Board phase II report on tariff items concerning goods made and not made in Canada. These recommendations concerning the measures we are adopting in that respect result from a commitment made by Canada at the Tokyo Round of the series of multilateral trade negotiations.

[English]

For years one of the significant features of the customs tariff has been the determination of rate of duty based on whether or not the goods are made in Canada. Generally imported goods which are also made in Canada attract a higher rate of duty. However, our trading partners objected to this approach because of the uncertainty created for their exporters. Determination of whether goods were deemed to be made in Canada was an administrative decision made by Customs, and the status of goods can change with little notice. They argued for identifying the goods that were determined to be made and not made in Canada. Therefore, in return for freer access for some of our exports to major markets, Canada agreed to undertake a review of its "made-not made" tariff items. The matter was referred to the tariff board for study and public comment, and its reports and recommendations were issued in two phases. Most of the tariff board recommendations have been implemented by previous legislation. The tariff changes encompassed by this Bill complete the outstanding statutory changes required as a result of our Tokyo Round commitments.

The Bill also contains items related to certain aspects of the tariff component of the Government's response to the U.S. action on cedar shakes and shingles. I am certain Hon. Members will readily recall that in response to the U.S. imposition of a 35 per cent tariff on Canadian exports of cedar shakes and shingles we imposed higher rates of duty on a range of goods, originating principally in the U.S., through the introduction of a notice of a Ways and Means motion in the House last June. We also acted to tighten controls on the export of cedar logs and bolts, and these actions were not taken lightly. We needed to send a strong message to the U.S. about its protectionist acts and we had to guard against the loss of Canadian jobs, and this we accomplished.

The action taken by the Government totally achieved its purpose. The restrictions on the exports of cedar logs and bolts protected the competitiveness of the Canadian industry while