

Canada-U.S. Automotive Agreement

news clipping I have in my hand states in part:

Fears of go-it-alone Canadian alternatives—harmful to the U.S.—were cited as primary reasons for approval by major speakers from both Democratic and Republican parties.

The United States gains substantial benefits from trade with Canada, just as we gain from trade with the United States. I do not think we should be reluctant in pressing our demands when negotiating agreements with our great neighbour to the south. I do not think we should hide our light under a bushel, or act like lambs in our negotiations.

In concluding I should like to express concern about the ultimate implications of government policies in this field, and to join with my colleague, the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) in his hope that no further continentalism of this type will take place in future negotiations. I hope there will be no more back door entries of this kind, but rather that such agreements will be placed before this House of Commons for a full and complete airing, so that the final results will represent the true desires of Canadians.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, my participation in this debate will be very brief. We on this side of the house are aware that there are a tremendous number of complaints being made about this agreement, not only about the effects of it, but also about the way in which it was negotiated and put before this house. We believe assurances are required that any future action of this type by the minister or the government will be placed before parliament before it is taken.

• (9:40 p.m.)

We feel that our responsibility to Canada and the industry is such that we must, under the circumstances, be able to hear and understand all the complaints that are brought forward. We know there is some advantage in this agreement. We also know there is in it some great disadvantage in regard to the smaller types of manufacturing plants, and therefore to many Canadian municipalities and people. This has been made very evident in the course of the debate.

Inasmuch as the agreement is in effect, and has been for this protracted period of time, without the possibility of discussion in parliament, so as to provide a safeguard for the future which was not provided in the method used to implement the agreement, I

[Mr. Saltsman.]

believe this entire matter should be sent to the standing committee for consideration as has already been suggested. But as an alternative to this suggestion, it is my pleasure now to move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard):

That after the word "same" in line 4 there be added the following:
"provided that the said agreement may not be renewed in its present or in an amended form without the prior consent of parliament."

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I—

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether Your Honour would be prepared to hear argument on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I should very honestly tell hon. members that I had anticipated, as I assume I should, this type of amendment and have given the matter serious thought during the day. I have very serious doubts whether this amendment is receivable or not; but I would be very grateful to hon. members if they would help the Chair in reaching a decision in the matter.

Mr. Lambert: I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the question of whether a resolution may be amended is a fairly thorny one, outside of course the obvious six months hoist or something of that nature. But that is not the purpose of this amendment. Earlier this evening I sought to move an amendment to send the agreement to a committee of the house for consideration. Mr. Speaker's deputy at the time ruled it out of order and referred to a citation in Beauchesne on which I must reserve opinion because I want to see the citation's references. Sometimes I must regretfully conclude that some of the outright authorities so indicated are on some other proposition, and not all these references can be taken at their absolute face value.

Be that as it may, Your Honour's deputy made that ruling with regard to sending the agreement to a committee. However, the purpose of this amendment is merely to impose a proviso, which is within the power of parliament, in regard to a resolution. The resolution asks for the approval of parliament, and parliament is entitled, I would submit to Your Honour, to impose a condition upon its approval. This is all the amendment seeks to do. It does not seek to introduce any new subject matter which goes beyond the resolution. All it says is that if the house accepts the original motion, it will approve the agreement, but that such agreement cannot be renewed in its present or in an amended form