

Free Trade

guarantee basis to the U.S. market. If the Government is straightforward and open, its members will admit that in their speeches as they talk about the motion.

I can go through the details and point out two key problems concerning the deal. First, on countervail and anti-dumping issues, the so-called trade remedy laws within the United States, a panel system is established for appeals, but that panel system "wants to review what happens in order to see to it if U.S. law has been followed" in the case of our companies in the United States. In short, and I quote directly from page 273:

—to determine whether such determination—

that is by the United States:

"—was in accordance with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the importing Party".

Mr. McDermid: Canadian law is still in effect too.

Mr. Langdon: In other words, does a company in my constituency go to United States and face the same kind of neutral assessment, some sort of just view of what is fair? No, Mr. Speaker. It faces instead the rules which are established within U.S. legislation, and it has to deal with those rules. It can only appeal on the basis of those rules. There is no kind of neutral basis, no agreed basis, of what is a subsidy for both countries.

That matters tremendously because the basic problem with the United States system is that the U.S. in its countervail system establishes a very curious way of looking at issues. It says that if Canada, for instance—and there have been 13 cases against Canada in recent years—

Mr. McDermid: How many have we had against the U.S.?

Mr. Langdon: Five. Thirteen to five.

Mr. McDermid: How many?

Mr. Langdon: Thirteen to five.

Mr. McDermid: How many anti-dumping?

Mr. Langdon: I am talking about countervail. If the Member does not want to listen, he does not have to, but he could keep his ears open and he might learn something. There have been 13 countervail actions by the United States against Canada. In each of those cases it was examined quite clearly what Canada did with respect to subsidies, not whether the United States itself provided subsidies and, therefore, Canada had some sort of valid fair right to do the same thing.

There is absolutely nothing in U.S. law which requires the United States to look at the subsidies which its firms receive which complain about subsidies that Canadian firms receive. That is just not fair to our workers or to our business people. That is what should have been changed if the Government had got the objective it said it was seeking. Instead, the Government failed to get that objective. Now it is trying to tell

Canadians that somehow the Government has achieved those goals despite the fact that the record is very clear, but it has not in any sense achieved those goals whatever.

Moreover, we have to look at something that is even worse. The United States, so long as it names Canada, can change its countervail and anti-dumping laws at any point in the future if it wishes. That applies to Canada as well.

Mr. McDermid: No.

Mr. Langdon: So long as it is within the context of GATT, it applies to Canada.

Mr. McDermid: No.

● (1630)

Mr. Langdon: I am sorry, it does. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary has not read the agreement. Unfortunately, he is not listening. Perhaps if he did listen, he would hear what I am saying.

If these laws are changed in the United States, and if Canada is named in the change, then it applies to Canada and we have to accept that change. It is true, we can take it to a panel, but that panel cannot make any sort of decision. The panel can only say to the United States: "Tut, tut, you have not done things the way you should have and Canada therefore has the right to retaliate". Is that not wonderful? We have the right in the future to do what we now have the right to do.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): If the Hon. Member is having a question and answer session, I would appreciate if he directed it through the Chair.

Mr. Langdon: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that the Parliamentary Secretary might follow that instruction as well.

This Government sought certain goals and, I must say, sought them with some energy. It sought those goals actively and it talked about those goals, but it did not succeed in any way in achieving those goals. Because of that, the deal that has been brought back is fatally flawed. It is simply not acceptable in the light of what business people across Canada told the committee as it travelled the country.

The people told us that they had sought secure and guaranteed access to the U.S. market. The Government failed to achieve that. The Government should recognize that and express its shame in that failure.

An Hon. Member: Sheer nonsense.

Mr. Langdon: It is absolutely true.

That is what the Government failed to achieve. What did it give away in the process of these negotiations? It gave away a tremendous amount.

The Government gave away a tremendous number of things that were of special concern to average people. First, it gave away jobs. It is quite clear that there will be thousands of jobs