

Statements by Ministers

substance. He may indulge the House with a thoughtful speech on the subject later on.

Mr. McDermid: It will be a lot more interesting than this one.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will have noted that when the Right Hon. Prime Minister was speaking there was great courtesy extended. While I know that the debate which is taking place is one of great importance and strong feelings, I ask all Members to give the appropriate courtesies to the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

Mr. Broadbent: Thank you. I now want to touch upon some of the very specific aspects of the agreement. I hope the Government will reply. Instead of indulging in generalities I hope the Government will explain the agreement sector by sector and show us where we are wrong.

With regard to agriculture, the concessions have been made overwhelmingly by Canada. A range of agricultural tariff and import licences will be eliminated on wheat, barley, oats and grain. I am sure that everyone on the Prairies will read the news of this agreement with absolute horror. The Government has abandoned a 50-year tradition central to agriculture, not only on the Prairies but in the Okanagan Valley, many parts of Ontario, Quebec, and the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia. Agriculture in all these areas and more will be negatively affected. This is a Canadian concession of considerable proportions in agriculture.

With regard to the automotive industry, the language is by no means clear but it looks as though the tariffs in the Auto Pact will be phased out completely. No one has denied that yet. If the tariffs are phased out completely we will lose the stick which played an effective role in getting investment decisions in Canada.

This is not abstract talk. Had it not been pointed out to the Chrysler Corporation that it was not living up to its investment commitments under the Auto Pact and told that if it did not live up to them it would have to start paying a duty on products imported into Canada, there would not be a new van plant in the City of Windsor. The Government was intellectually dishonest when it said that the Auto Pact was not on the table. Without the tariffs and enforcement mechanisms the pact is absolutely destroyed and the Government should have the honesty to say that to the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: If I understand the information which we have so far with regard to this agreement, in addition to dealings with the North American car makers, our sovereignty has been restricted in terms of making deals in our interests with non-North American producers. As I understand it, we can no longer have an independent automotive policy which would apply to Datsun, Volkswagen or Honda. They will now come within the framework of a new North American policy. If North American content provisions are applied as opposed

to Canadian, instead of being located to meet Canadian conditions of production these companies will no longer come into Canada but will more likely be located in the larger market in the United States and will export their products into Canada.

Mr. McDermid: You have an inferiority complex.

Mr. Broadbent: Not at all, my friend.

Mr. McDermid: Sure you do.

Mr. Broadbent: I will not cite Tommy Douglas or David Lewis, I will just indicate to my Conservative friend that Sir John A. Macdonald would think he is talking through his hat right now.

The Auto Pact is in total jeopardy and our ability to control other automotive decisions independently has been thrown out of the window by this agreement as I understand it.

With regard to the service industry, the rule is that any law which we apply here to Canadian firms will have to be exactly the same as those which would apply to American firms.

Miss Carney: Not true.

Mr. Broadbent: I read the document that was produced by the United States which the Americans say is the official document.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: We now hear some of the cabinet Ministers laughing about this. Let them get to their feet later in this discussion and correct these observations if they are wrong. This happens to be what the Americans think they have got from this deal. In bargaining between this Government and the Americans, the Americans have come out on top without exception in recent history, as I am sure they did this time.

Mr. McDermid: Inferiority complex again.

Mr. Broadbent: We'll leave the noise-makers down there.

Not in my worst nightmares did I think that the Government would betray us completely on the protection of our cultural industries. Since we have not yet received a text from the Canadian Government I will quote from the U.S. document on this subject. It says:

—The United States wants to ensure that Canadian cultural policies do not constitute a discriminatory and unnecessary barrier to U.S. trade.

The document goes on to say:

For its part, Canada has agreed that cultural measures it takes will not impair the benefits the United States would otherwise expect—

In other words, if anything we do to ensure the growth and vitality of Canadian culture flies in the face of U.S. practice at home and their commercial expectations, it will not be accepted. We reject that approach to the protection of Canadian culture.