

Softwood Lumber

I think that has been said earlier, but it is important to repeat it, nobody wins in that war. In Canada, jobs are at stake, industries which have difficulty making ends meet are affected, but on the American side consumers are the ones who are affected. It is they who, ultimately, will have to pay this 14.5 per cent duty. In this regard, I wonder, if our government should not undertake a huge lobbying and advertising campaign directed at American consumer groups, send delegations to the United States and pay for full pages, if need be, in the *New York Times*, in order to warn American consumers that, ultimately, they are the hostages of that duty. I think that the government should also get involved in this advertising or marketing campaign to warn American consumers that, ultimately, they will be the losers. We should bring them to understand, and they know it, that Canadian lumber is of higher quality. That is why people want our lumber and why we have a good record, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the government to look at these possibilities, helping small companies pay their security bonds while at the same time flooding our American friends with massive advertising aimed at consumers. We should remember, however, that the findings are only preliminary and we should not give up, we should continue to do what the Prime Minister and other ministers have done over the last few days, voice our dissatisfaction, our bitterness and our anger toward the Americans so that they stop this inquiry immediately and not wait till July for the four steps to be completed.

I think we can make them withdraw that decision and it is up to us, as parliamentarians, in co-operation with the industry and the provinces, to let the United States know that it is acting wrongly, that it is not in its interest, nor ours, and that it should review that decision unfortunately taken irresponsibly, without knowing precisely what was involved.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we will be vindicated as we were in 1982 and again in 1986. As I said earlier, each passing day or week is one too many for our workers to bear. I ask the government to continue putting pressure on the United States administration and commerce department to cease immediately this unwarranted harassment.

[English]

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, this issue that is before us tonight is one that is very, very important to many small and large communities across this country.

In retaliation to Canada's October 4, 1991 decision to terminate the 15 per cent export tax on softwood lumber exports to the United States, the memorandum of understanding, the U.S. department of commerce immediately initiated a countervailing duty investigation.

The investigation has resulted in a 14.48 per cent American duty on Canadian softwood lumber exports to the United States. The department of commerce is also demanding that Canadian exporters in all but the four Atlantic provinces start posting bonds immediately on shipments to the United States. They call it the good neighbour policy.

Time and time again, during the free trade debate in this House, the Conservative government promised Canadians that the free trade agreement would secure our access to the U.S. markets.

Look at the reality. Canadian pork producers, steel producers and in the past week Honda automobiles and now our softwood lumber producers are being subjected to this harassment. Obviously we did not get secure access to the U.S. market.

We also mention the non-tariff duties that the Americans are suddenly implementing at the American border for Canadian products going into the United States.

I bring up the case again of a company in my own riding, Eddy Match of Pembroke whose product was stopped at the U.S. border because the "Made in Canada" logo was not in the right place.

• (2300)

That affects many lines of industry in this country. This is the third time the U.S. has induced a countervailing duty challenge against Canadian softwood lumber, and also the third different methodology used in a decade of hassle and harassment of Canadian lumber exports. We were far better off when we had the GATT because at least we could take it to GATT for a ruling.

The Mulroney government should never have signed the memorandum of understanding in 1986. It never even let the case come to a decision. It hurried and signed the memorandum of understanding. We won the