

*Supply*

I would like to quote briefly from an article by Terrence Wills of *The Gazette*. It reads:

Reisman's mandate does not—

—and I underline the word “not”—

—include bargaining the removal of restrictions on U.S. ownership in areas like Canadian chartered banks, newspapers or radio and TV.

This is a person from the media speaking. The article continues:

Nor is the Canadian team authorized to negotiate elimination of such policies as ensuring Canadian control in book publishing, or a majority of Canadian directors on the boards of foreign companies.

All the poppycock from the Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria), who has now left after giving a very low-quality speech as always—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. The Hon. Member knows that she should not reflect on attendance in the House. The Hon. Member could be in the lobby watching the Hon. Member on television. I do not think a reflection upon who is and who is not in the House is necessary at this time of the day.

**Mrs. Mailly:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I got carried away. However, I must note that there is no one on the other side and yet this is an NDP motion. I find it rather spooky to be speaking to my own people. I am preaching to the converted.

As I was saying, the article is quite clear. Mr. Reisman has a clear mandate to maintain and protect Canada's cultural industries. They are not an issue in these talks. This is not news. This has been the stated position of the Government from the very outset of the trade negotiations. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark), the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney), the Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) and many, many Members on this side of the House have made our position known to Canadians, to Americans, and to Members opposite on countless occasions.

Let me remind Members of the words of the Prime Minister in this House in September, 1985. He said:

Our political sovereignty, our system of social programs, our commitment to fight regional disparities, our unique cultural identity, our special linguistic character—these are the essence of Canada. They are not at issue in these negotiations.

[*Translation*]

I repeat that neither our political sovereignty nor our social programs nor our commitment to fight regional disparity—this on-going Canadian problem we have tried to resolve by spending enormous amounts of money but which is still with us—and certainly not our cultural identity or our language, Mr. Speaker, none of these are at issue in the trade talks.

[*English*]

The motion before us suggests that the Government has not been firm with the Americans on this issue. The movers have surely forgotten the message that the Prime Minister took

directly to the American people in his speech in Chicago in December of 1985 when he said:

When it comes to discussing better trade rules for cultural industries, you will have to understand that what we call cultural sovereignty is as vital to our national life as political sovereignty . . . In the United States you cast the net of national security over more areas than we; in Canada we cast the net of cultural sovereignty more widely than you.

[*Translation*]

That is also what the Minister for International Trade had in mind when she said last October that a clear message had been sent to our negotiators that the present Government's ability to protect and enrich Canadian culture would not be on the table. The essence of our Canadian identity cannot and must not be compromised. That is clear. Or, as was said in this respect by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) on another occasion: The question whether certain Canadian cultural industries require certain specific support measures is a matter of internal policy falls outside the purview of trade negotiations.

[*English*]

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the Government's position has been unequivocal. To suggest otherwise is, as I said, mischievous, which is a polite way of saying that they are stretching the truth. All Members know how many times this matter has been raised in the House and how straightforward we have been in reiterating our fundamental belief in the need to maintain and enhance support measures for the arts in our cultural industries.

Only eight weeks ago the House spent a full day debating a motion of the Minister for International Trade in support of the negotiations. That motion specified very clearly that the Government would continue to protect our political sovereignty, social programs, agricultural marketing systems, the auto industry, and our unique cultural identity.

During that debate the Minister of Communications spoke of the new maturity of our nation, of the inherent strength of our national character, of the self-confidence of a country whose identity is no longer in question. She reminded us all of the richness of our heritage, of the broad sweep of history that has brought together peoples from many cultures to form a unique society proud of its heritage and distinct in its social, cultural and political traditions.

Ours is an outward looking country, a nation whose voices are heard and whose presence is felt around the world and in many fields; in architecture and the arts, in music and dance, in science, in medicine, in engineering and in commerce, to name but a few.

[*Translation*]

Communications and other cultural ties that are crucial to the unity of our country arise from the make-up of our population, our cultural heritage and the special cultural mosaic and diversity that people from every part of the globe have brought, and continue to bring, to this vast country of ours. Canada plays a unique role in the world, a role of which