

*Supply*

Marjorie Cohen, one of the eminent economists, with whom presumably the Minister of Industry does not agree, and he certainly did not make reference to her in his speech, has done a very detailed study. In a book, which has recently been published, she has indicated very clearly that the service sector is very much at threat and the women within that service sector will be the victims of that threat.

We could talk about investment on the subject of which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) earlier this afternoon tried to suggest that the question in front of us with this free trade pact is whether or not we wish more investment in this country. That is not the question. The question opened up by this free trade agreement, by this trade pact, is not a question of open investment. It is a question of takeovers which will take from the total of 7,500 firms which were formerly protected by review procedures so that an American company could not come in and simply take over a firm and shut it down to get rid of the competition. It will reduce that figure from 7,500 to only 500 firms in this country which are protected.

That type of change is inexcusable. It leaves small companies, such as those whose representatives I was talking to this morning in Guelph, with a sense of tremendous vulnerability, and a reality which faces them that at any stage they can be taken over without any review whatever on the part of the Government of this country. They can be shut down, turned into warehouses or small subsidiary operations, and again and again jobs will be lost as a consequence.

We can talk about film distribution. The Government has claimed that it has done nothing with respect to film distribution. Yet, within the U.S. briefing papers from that Government, there is the following statement, "The Canadian Government has also promised to solve Jack Valenti's problem on film distribution within the next two weeks". We know quite well that there has been a commitment made which at this very moment the Department of Communications is trying hard to struggle with, because it is very difficult, I would say it is impossible, to protect a place for Canadian films in the future, and at the same time to satisfy the motion picture industry of the United States which Jack Valenti represents.

We can talk about agriculture, which indeed tomorrow on our opposition day we will focus on as one sector which has been hung out to dry by the Government.

**Mr. Mayer:** That is not true, and you know it.

**Mr. Langdon:** That is one sector which has been given a tremendous set of threats, attacks, and sabotage as far as this fundamental and basic industry in our country is concerned.

As a country, what do we get in return? We get a toothless tiger; a hopeless, ineffective, completely unacceptable system of appeals which is so far from anything the Government talked about prior to the free trade signatures on that piece of paper that it is ludicrous.

For instance, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) told the House of Commons at one stage that it would be absolutely ridiculous to accept a tribunal which did not have rules. Yet that is exactly what has been accepted, a tribunal which will make judgments, not on the basis of agreed rules, not on the basis of some type of common definition of subsidies, but instead on the basis of United States laws.

It is unbelievable that a Government of this country would sign an agreement which puts the future of this country, the future business activities of this country in the United States completely under U.S. law. With respect to the appeals mechanism, there is no capacity for it to do anything but apply U.S. law, and in the process back up what the Government itself has criticized as laws that are unfair to this country.

One could continue, but I wish to spend a few moments dealing with perhaps the most amazing attempt to sell this agreement for something that it is not that we have yet seen in this country. I am referring to the attempt to sell the provisions which deal with the auto industry as somehow something that will benefit the country. The reality is that there are three key parts of the agreement in respect of the auto industry which affect our future, especially the future of communities like mine and others right across the country that depend upon the auto industry.

- (1740)

First, there is the elimination of the stick, which has enforced the safeguards that have made the Auto Pact a successful exercise in sectoral trade between Canada and the United States. That goes. It is eliminated. It is finished.

Second, there is the elimination of the possibility of putting Japanese and Korean companies under the auspices of the Auto Pact. Again this means that we cannot ever get the 60 per cent Canadian content which we had hoped to get at some stage in the future from these Japanese and Korean companies. There will be no capacity to enforce that kind of law and get the resulting jobs, parts purchases, and prosperity that the country could have from a policy of that sort.

Finally, the duty remission provisions were something which we as an independent country had the possibility of being able to use to help our parts producers. That, too, is eliminated as a possibility in the future. Existing duty remission schemes will have to be done away with.

In respect of the hard sell about the auto industry, there has also been a tremendous lack of truth. The Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney), for instance, said to the House on June 23: "We do not intend to alter the Auto Pact". Yet, in each of the detailed ways I have indicated, that Pact has been altered. All we have to do is to look at the U.S. assessment in briefing papers on the subject. They say quite clearly that the opportunities for increased domestic sourcing of parts, that is sourcing of parts in the United States, and therefore the creation of jobs in the United States, have been increased by the changes about which I have been talking.