

changes of some magnitude. If members of export associations and others want to appear before the committee and express their views, I hope the government will welcome them. A declaration of this kind by cabinet members would alleviate the very serious situation which has developed as a result of the peculiar operations of certain people in positions of responsibility.

What about the bill generally? We have had a good debate on it. Exports are of the greatest importance to this country. In view of what has been said by members on both sides of the chamber, I think we are aware of the risks and dangers which we face. Anyone who reads, watches, listens and learns will reach the conclusion that the likelihood of the United Kingdom entering the Common Market is very much greater than it was a year ago. The Prime Minister of that country was the principal negotiator in the previous Conservative administration. I understand that he has very definite views about the conditions involving entry of the United Kingdom into the Common Market. Negotiations have now progressed to the stage where the likelihood of entry appears very great. There is a very strong probability that the financial differences, differences involving agricultural produce and other difficulties with relation to the Common Market will be resolved. Within a year or 18 months Britain may become a member of the Europe—an Economic Community.

We must also look at the situation in the United States. While it is true that the trade restriction bill which went before Congress last year did not pass before Congress closed, this was only because the bill had been tacked on to other legislation which was opposed by members of the Senate. The bill died at the conclusion of the congressional proceedings at the beginning of this month. However, we must remember that it was an administration bill. It was introduced by the government. The bill was apparently proposed by the President because of political obligations which he incurred during the course of the election. There is no doubt that the United States administration, which is receiving increased support in Congress, the House of Representatives and other parts of the United States, tends toward a greater degree of protectionism. We have to live with this. I do not decry the job that our negotiators did during the Kennedy Round talks. They benefited this country. However, they did so on instructions of the government.

If the negotiators had had their own way, they might have been willing to be more flexible in horse trading. In the result, it seems we have had a free ride for quite a long time. We obtained benefits from the Kennedy round talks for a number of reasons. I will not go into them now. I do not think those reasons exist any longer. We may find that we are left in a hard-hearted world as far as international trade is concerned. I think we will find that the ease with which we have been able to extend our economic operations and external trade in the past has vanished. Some benefits arose from our very large sales of agricultural products, natural gas and petroleum. The United States-Canada automotive trade pact is very definitely being threatened in the United States.

*Export Development Act*

● (8:20 p.m.)

Our opportunity to continue our trading operations, to expand them or even to hold them at the present level will depend on a number of factors including legislation of the kind before us. We do not have the benefit of an economy of scale in our own country. We have to rely on an economy of expertise, on an economy of automation. The well known French writer and political expert, Servan-Schreiber, in his book "American Challenge" referred to this. I do not agree with everything he says in his book, but every Canadian could read it with profit. There are difficulties envisaged there.

There was a debate here today between the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) and some of the members of the New Democratic Party about American ownership and Canadian nationalism. In my view, this is a debate which is not of great profit to the House or to the country. No doubt there are problems, but I thoroughly disapprove of any shrill, strident anti-Americanism. Equally, it is of no use trying to minimize the difficulties which face us in connection with the great multinational corporations which we have.

While the subject is only incidental to the bill before us, I should like to draw attention to the usefulness of the approach made under the administration of my right hon. friend from Prince Albert who instituted, in conjunction with the late President Eisenhower, a study of this question on an international basis. This is not a situation which affects Canada or the United States alone; it is an international situation and we should look at it in this light rather than conduct sterile debates on a topic which I fear may become a political issue in the next federal election. Now is the time to launch, at the instigation of Canada, an international campaign to hold meetings and discussions on an international level.

That is all I wish to say generally. I am sure the bill will receive study in committee. I think it can be improved, but I shall not specify the improvements now. That is a matter to be considered later by the committee. I would, however, ask the Parliamentary Secretary to comment on one point which has puzzled me. I shall not debate the basis of the change, but clause 7 of the bill would make certain changes with regard to the nature of an instrument which can be regulated and dealt with by the corporation in the course of its financial operations. The original wording provided that negotiable instruments could be dealt with under clause 33 of the original bill, but the word "negotiable" has been removed and in its place we find the word "instrument" alone. "Instrument" as defined in the original bill means something far different from "negotiable instrument," as all of us with knowledge of the law or knowledge of business practice appreciate. I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary when he closes the debate to tell us precisely the reason for the inclusion of clause 7. Is it intended to minimize the type of security to be dealt with in the manner set out in clause 33 of the original bill, or is it merely for the sake of bringing about certain changes in terminology?