

Supply

Mr. Keeper: It is working for the Americans.

Mr. Langdon: As my colleague says, our trade policy has been to make things right for Americans, not to protect Canadian producers.

Frankly, in each case we have had to give up, to give in to the United States, to give it what it wanted. The reason for that is absolutely clear-cut. It lies in the desperate effort of the Government to try to achieve a free trade agreement at any price or at any cost, with any sacrifice and with any loss to Canadian people, regardless of what happens to Canada. It is a process which has been getting worse and worse as Parliament has gone on. It is a process which should not even be in place. If any of the promises made by President Reagan at the Quebec Summit to ensure that there was not a single step taken by the United States to increase protectionism against Canada had meant anything aside from rhetoric, none of this would have happened. In every case, and I omit none, the trade position of the Government has created a worse position for Canada than when we started out.

In the case of FERC, frankly there are things we can do. For instance, we should raise the whole question in the free trade talks. We should also look very carefully at whether legislation is possible on our side of the border which would prevent this American incursion of their laws and regulations into our jurisdiction. If the Government said it was looking at that, I would accept that at least it was doing something for Canadians. As it stands, I can see nothing at all being done.

Mr. Shields: Madam Speaker, I have a short question for the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon). He went to a great deal of effort to explain that the NDP policy on natural gas exports is no longer Party policy and that it now has a new policy which says that reasonable export of natural gas should take place. How can the Member square this with the October 1986 Resolutions Reference? Let me quote from the New Democrats 1986 Resolutions Reference. It reads:

This book contains those resolutions passed by the New Democrats since 1961 which are still current today. That is, resolutions which have not been overtaken by events—

● (1630)

The introduction states that these resolutions “are still current today”. We have the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor, the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) and the Hon. Member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), who is the Energy critic, saying the particular resolution is no longer valid because it was passed at the time of the energy crisis. How can the New Democrats square this when it is pointed out to them that the introduction to the Resolutions Reference goes on to state that these are resolutions which have not been overtaken by events?

The Hon. Member for Vancouver Kingsway stated on Friday that New Democratic Party policy is that there should be reasonable natural gas exports. I am not sure what that means. He may not have the authority—maybe the Hon.

Member for Essex—Windsor can confirm this—to make such a commitment. The New Democratic Party constitution calls for policy statements to be consistent with resolutions passed by NDP conventions.

Is the Member for Essex—Windsor saying that really this has been passed by an NDP convention, it is on the books as policy but that Members of the caucus in the House of Commons can negate what went on at the convention? Are they saying they can change the policy unilaterally? That is not the way their papers read. Perhaps the Member from Essex—Windsor could clarify that position.

Mr. Langdon: Madam Speaker, I must say it is amusing to hear such comments coming from a Party led by a Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) who in 1983 stated that he was opposed to free trade—

Mr. Shields: Answer the question.

Mr. Langdon:—that free trade would lead to a situation where branch plants in Canada would leave Canada, where Canadian jobs would be drastically threatened and, as a result, his Party should never espouse, promote or push for free trade with the United States.

Times change, I suppose, in the Conservative Party. They seem to change a little bit faster than most and for less clear cut reasons.

Mr. Shields: He won't answer.

Mr. Langdon: With respect to our Party, I can certainly answer because I was chairperson of our policy review committee at the time that those policies to which the Hon. Member referred were passed. I continue to maintain that the thrust of the resolutions which were passed in that resolutions convention and were passed in resolutions conventions that we have held each two years since 1961 will form important considerations and the basic thrusts of what we would want to do as the Government of this country. I am certainly not going to say that each and every detail of such policy resolutions is as deathless in its prose as it was at the time.

What is crucial is that there was a commitment to our energy policy which was passed at that time to try to see to it that Canadians came first, and that commitment is as clear-cut as it was in 1979. It is a commitment which would lead us, as I have suggested with respect to Amoco, to take a completely different policy than this Government did. With respect to gas exports it would also lead us to take a completely different approach. For instance, we have been much more concerned about many of the small scale gas producers—

Mr. Shields: Answer the question.

Mr. Langdon:—which have been locked in by previous Governments' positions. Our position would be to try to open up both the Canadian market, and where the Canadian market is secure, other markets, such as the United States, to potential export from those small producers so that they too could gain