

Supply

roared. Now he wants us to develop an aggressive position while saying that we cannot negotiate or compete with the United States. He now wants us to become the aggressor, saying that that will be the solution. The arguments of the Hon. Member and other members of his Party are not coherent or organized. They are trying to create confusion to muddle the minds of Canadians. They present so many arguments which are diametrically opposed that they think the poor Canadians will not be able to figure this out. I am sure that they will be suprised.

The Member says that they want a war of trade. He wants the matter to turn into an adversarial situation of even greater proportion than it now is. This is terribly surprising and concerning. A member from his Party said this morning that we have not been talking and negotiating enough to avoid this potential countervailing situation in connection with rubber. He is also pre-empting the talks. Earlier there was rhetoric coming from this side indicating that things were being pre-empted and predecided. He has already made the decision that the U.S. will never give up on countervail. Yet, this morning the Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) said that potential countervail should not happen. We hear doom and gloom right from the start from that Party. The Member talks about a wing and a prayer. The Government knows that negotiations with the United States can fly and we intend to put the intelligent word out to the Canadian electorate in an organized and straightforward plan which they will understand, rather than relying on confusion.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hate to leave the Member for Sarnia—Lambton (Mr. James) confused. That would do no good. My speech was not meant to be anti-American but to recognize certain realities which exist. These realities are, in some respects, the very same realities which the Minister of International Trade noted this morning. The fact is that there is a great deal of countervailing action being undertaken by the United States. It has been extended more and more widely, and has in fact been used by the Government as a reason for trying to undertake these freer trade talks.

The point is not that that is anti-American. It is a reality to which we must react. The question is what capacity we have with which to react and what is the best way to react. At the moment our capacity to react is limited. It was the conclusion of the special committee which looked at the issue last summer that our own countervail laws were not sufficiently strong. I simply make that point here.

We must choose the route which is likely to result in success with respect to trade. We are talking about trade wars—nothing more dramatic than that. This is a serious issue in my part of the country, as I suspect it is in the Hon. Member's part of the country. We must decide what is the best way to deal with that problem. I make the case that it is much better to take a route which draws allies with us and gives us the chance to try to push back against what has become a very aggressive American approach on trade, which is recognized throughout the world.

In closing, in its trade relations with the United States the European community has been very much more aggressive. I think it is working out solutions for which it is much more respected than is the case with us.

Mr. Caldwell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to my colleague from my neighbouring riding of Essex—Windsor. He continues to oppose the idea of entering into a bilateral trade agreement with the United States. He has many fears of this and plants the fear in people's mind that Windsor, which is a border town, is going to suffer because of any enhanced trade. He mentioned hogs as an example. Would it not be wiser if we were able to entrench that \$800 million market with an agreement similar to what we have regarding the Auto Pact which the UAW opposed when it was being negotiated? They are now, of course, opposing any enhanced agreement with the United States. Is this not a similar situation? I cannot understand the Hon. Member continuing to be fearful of an agreement such as this when, at the same time, he holds up the Auto Pact as one of the greatest agreements ever signed. That pact was negotiated by Simon Reisman, the same person now negotiating for Canada on free trade. The UAW opposed that then, and now they oppose bilateral talks. Does he not want to see our farmers in Essex County get a good agreement, one similar to the Auto Pact?

● (1530)

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, that mixes together so many magnificent things that one hardly knows which string to pull to start with. Let me try.

First, each of us must attempt to assess the likelihood that we as a country are going to get from the U.S. something which will safeguard us. In the case of the Auto Pact, we got those safeguards because we were dealing with one sector and we fought very hard. Mr. Reisman himself said he opposed such safeguards, but the Government of the day, perhaps because of pressure from the UAW, who know, told him to insist on safeguards. Those safeguards, as he and I both know, have been absolutely crucial for and beneficial to Canada in that particular case. It is because of those safeguards that we hold up the Auto Pact as a sensible and desirable kind of development.

However, with respect to hogs, we have to ask the honest question: Is the U.S. likely to do away with the power to apply countervailing duties as it has done over the past year with respect to the Hon. Member's farmers and my farmers, all of whom have been hurt quite badly? As reasonable people I think we have to look at the evidence. I have tried to put a little bit of that evidence on the record today. We have the comment from Mr. Merken that they do not believe it would be possible to exempt any country from countervailing duties or anti-dumping laws. He, of course, is the U.S. deputy trade representative with special responsibility for—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired. Debate.