

*Oral Questions*

**Ms. McDonald:** Mr. Speaker, is Canadian ownership in the film distribution industry an objective of the Government and, if so, will the Prime Minister say so?

If outright ownership is not an objective, is film import licensing at least an objective of the Government and, if so, will the Government prove it by bringing in a Bill on film import licensing, a Bill which is ready, or must we believe that the Government has reneged on this policy?

**Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, from the outset the Prime Minister, the Minister for International Trade, and the Government have stated that our cultural industries would be protected in any trade negotiation, and indeed they have been.

I thought the Hon. Member would be congratulating us on the fact that Bill C-58 has remained intact, that our Canadian content regulations have remained intact, and that our simultaneous substitution has remained intact. All these things have stayed intact as we said they would.

The Government has indicated that it is prepared to create a Canadian market for film distribution rights and that Canadian independent distributors should have access to those rights. There is nothing in this agreement that prevents the implementation of that policy.

## BOOK PUBLISHING INDUSTRY

**Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is on book publishing. Would the Minister tell us if the so-called Baie Comeau declaration is still operative, including the ban on indirect takeovers? If it still is operative, is all cultural investment to be exempted, without any exception, in takeovers of Canadian corporations?

If so, would the Government show some good faith on this issue by implementing that Baie Comeau declaration in the cases presently under study of American takeovers which have been sitting there and have not yet been turned down?

**Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, once again I thought the Hon. Member would be moving to congratulate the Government—

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Miss MacDonald:**—and I mean that quite seriously.

The document says that the parties agree that cultural industries are exempted, excluded, from the investment chapter. However, it goes on to say with regard to indirect acquisitions in the cultural field that the Canadian Government will, at a fair market value, buy those industries and then resell them to a Canadian purchaser. That is a big step forward. It really is.

• (1500)

## UNITED STATES ANTI-DUMPING LAW

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, Members are witnessing the strange spectacle today of seeing the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board disavowing and disowning the American interpretation of what was arrived at Sunday night. That causes Members to worry a great deal.

The U.S. trade representative in his document released today says:

The U.S. anti-dumping law—defined as U.S. statutes, legislative history, regulations, administrative practice and court decisions—will remain intact and unchanged. Hence, U.S. petitioners will retain all their rights under existing U.S. law—

Does the Prime Minister agree with that interpretation of what was signed on Sunday night?

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I have not read the U.S. interpretation of our agreement.

**Some Hon. Members:** You better.

**Miss Carney:** I prefer to read our interpretation of the agreement, and I prefer to read our agreement itself.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Miss Carney:** Members have waited 45 minutes for me to speak, Mr. Speaker. Possibly they would like to hear me at this time.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair has heard some whispered desire by some Members to hear the Hon. Minister. The Hon. Minister is answering a question and I think the usual courtesies should be extended. The Hon. Minister.

**Miss Carney:** Mr. Speaker, the point of the dispute settlement mechanism is that any decision, in the area of countervail and any decision in the area of anti-dumping and also in safeguards, can be taken to an impartial and binding hearing. That is what is important.

Earlier a question was raised in the Question Period about a statement of mine on March 16 saying that we would seek to eliminate these laws. That is where the negotiations broke down because neither side could develop the new laws in time to be effective for us.

What we have done in this case is to agree to give both countries time to develop this new law that is historic, that is unique, and that has never been done. In the meantime in the seven years—five years with a two year extension—each country will use its own law. Our problem is not in the law. We have good Canadian laws in this area. The Americans have good American laws in this area.