

Government of the United States and their administrative agencies did not accede to what some people considered to be a very strong case.

● (1430)

On the question of the export of steel pipe and other items of that kind to the United States, when we protested against what we thought was unfair conduct toward us, our protestations were considered. We have not won everything, but it seems to me that we ought not to lose sight of those instances where the Americans have been able to accede to our requests in this area. I also say to my honourable friend that if he is interested in trade between the two countries, the tariff barriers in Canada against American exports to this country and American tariffs against our exports to the United States are not the same. The American tariff structure is lower than ours at the present time. One has to take that into account when dealing with the Americans. So, while I am not here to advocate the interests of the United States—I am here to advocate the interests of Canada—I think we will get further in dealing with them if we try to put on the table the good things and the bad things, because when they have done some good things we ought to encourage them, for the simple reason that we will need their help in the future.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INCREASE IN CANADIAN FORCES CONTINGENT IN WESTERN EUROPE—EFFECT ON ESTABLISHMENT

Hon. Paul C. Lafond: Honourable senators, I welcome, as I think we all should, the announcement made on Monday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of National Defence that our contingent of land forces in western Europe will be increased by 1200. This is a positive, if incomplete, step toward implementing the recommendation made a few years ago by your National Defence Committee. My question to the Leader of the Government is this: Does that gesture mean that the authorization of man-years from the Department of National Defence will be increased by 1200, or does it mean that our already meagre home forces will be depleted by 1200 in order to fill part of a gap in western Europe?

Hon. Duff Roblin (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I share the satisfaction of my honourable friend with respect to this move, because it was clearly a part of the recommendations of the National Defence Committee with respect to manpower in the Canadian Armed Forces. Although this report was prepared some few years ago, it is, nevertheless, gratifying to see that we are now beginning to accept more of our responsibilities to NATO in this way. I would hope that the whole of these 1200 men will be found from the administrative tail that we have in this country, so that we can put the manpower we are already paying for to better use. However, I cannot tell my honourable friend categorically that that is the case, because the minister has announced that there is a cost of some \$50 million this year and some \$100 million next year on account of this move, which leads me to think

that it must involve salaries for additional personnel. I shall find out for sure and will let my friend know.

Senator Lafond: While the leader is doing that, he might try to discover, since the Secretary of State for External Affairs seems to be developing a propensity for accepting invitations to commit Canadian troops to peacekeeping undertakings, whether he is committing troops that the Minister of National Defence does not have or whether a similar increase in the number of authorized man-years would apply in these instances if our offers were accepted.

Senator Roblin: I am afraid that my honourable friend has posed a hypothetical question. Although the matter has been discussed in the news media and elsewhere, I do not think the minister has made any commitment at the present time. If he should make a commitment then the question becomes relevant and it will be answered.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, may I ask a supplementary question to those asked by Senator Lafond? With respect to the additional \$50 million that will be required to provide the additional land forces in Europe for 1985-86, is that amount already included in the Main Estimates for 1985-86 as tabled in the house on that memorable day, or will that \$50 million be provided for in a supplementary estimate?

Hon. Jacques Flynn: I thought you had time to study the estimates in detail.

Senator Roblin: That question is being investigated at the present time. I shall have an answer in due course.

Senator Flynn: You should know that. You know everything since you have passed the bill.

Senator MacEachen: It does not show.

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

CANADIAN ADVERTISING IN UNITED STATES MEDIA

Hon. Keith Davey: Honourable senators, I have a question for the government leader. As he knows, Bill C-58, passed in 1975, has been the salvation of the Canadian broadcasting industry. Indeed, CKND television in Winnipeg is an excellent case in point, a television station that simply would not exist without this legislation which eliminated the tax deduction for Canadian advertisers buying space or time in U.S. media. My question is whether or not this law, as some have suggested, will be discussed at the so-called Shamrock Summit.

Hon. Duff Roblin (Leader of the Government): The law my honourable friend refers to deals with advertising revenues with respect to transport or transmissions. It is perfectly true that this law has been a long-standing irritant as far as Americans are concerned. Every year that I and some of my colleagues have had occasion to talk with American congressmen, the subject has been raised. Certainly, it has not been forgotten. I would be surprised if our Prime Minister will raise the matter, but it is quite possible that the President might