

*Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement*

No, the FTA improves Canadian treatment of U.S. commercial interests in the cultural area. It provides for tariff elimination (e.g., on videos, records, printed material)—

The Government should have read the Donner report. While the Government stated that it carefully listened to the SAGITs, one of the most important reports the SAGIT heard was made by the recording industry. The recording industry indicated through the Donner report why it was not pleased with what would happen to the industry.

Our smaller printing and publication industries cannot enjoy the economies of scale and therefore will lose their power to produce some of our own materials.

The answer goes on to state:

In addition, the Free Trade Agreement allows the United States to take measures of equivalent commercial effect in the event that Canada enacts additional restrictions which impair U.S. access to the Canadian market.

In other words, if our attempt to recover our indigenous Canadian culture and access to Canadian culture affects their bottom line, no matter what the industry it will be unacceptable. We cannot even make a cultural impact on the world because the Bureau of Public Affairs goes on to state in its answer:

This right should serve as a dis-incentive to the use of cultural exceptions for measures that, although nominally cultural, have significant commercial effects.

Something nominally cultural would just happen to be our films, books and music. Those are the nominally cultural things which, through the Canada Council, we have seen fit to support. Various other programs, including Telefilm Canada and programs supporting a Canadian concept to the broadcasting industry, are the things that have Canadianized us through the communications industry. Instead, we have gone to a continentalist North American approach which is totally unacceptable.

• (1920)

I know there is not agreement on the part of my colleagues with this vision. We read American documents which indicate to American businesses that they do not have to worry. I suggest that we had better start worrying pretty darn quick.

I have come to the end of what I have to say, I see. I suggest that it would have been in the best interests of this country and of the Free Trade Agreement had the amendment we wanted to propose been debated and accepted by the House. That amendment provided that for greater certainty, nothing in the Act or agreement

shall limit or restrict the support of the Government of Canada for the development of cultural industries or cultural business in Canada.

I am speaking not only for myself. The artists and members of the performing industry in Canada are very seriously concerned. They have grave reservations about this Bill. Take a look at what has been done with respect to cultural industries under Article 1607.4. Investment in Canada and the purchase of Canadian cultural properties after 1992 is perfectly allowable under the deal we have now signed. I find that extremely regrettable. I cannot wait for your question, dear friend.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, it is a treat to which I had looked forward throughout the election campaign, because I had, in spite of what was happening elsewhere in Québec, very little doubt that our hon. friend would be back with us. I know that like many of us, she wondered at one point whether it would be worth doing again. We all have those moments of doubt, but I am delighted, for Mount Royal and for our country, that she is back, and I am sure she will serve very well.

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

**Mr. Edwards:** Now then—

**Mrs. Finestone:** First some soft soap, and then what?

**Mr. Edwards:** I find that the artists with whom I have spoken are far more interested in access to the Canadian market than in worrying about what may be happening external to them in a continentalist approach or a commercial approach.

My friend is more precise and more honest than the vast majority of them, but many opposition critics have said that the entire artistic community is rejecting this trade deal.

Just four names come to mind of people in the visual arts field who have embraced this trade deal as having the potential to create more wealth and thereby give us better business to support the arts. They are Ken Danby, Alex Colville, Christopher and Mary Pratt, all well-known, distinguished Canadian visual artists.

To come to my good friend's question and the point that she made about the statements of Congressman Rostenkowski and others, I would ask my hon. friend opposite how U.S. legislators or the U.S. administration would react to each of the statements that have been made in this debate in the House of Commons over the last two weeks.