

*Oral Questions*

have unilateral demilitarization just as you cannot have unilateral disarmament. I know the Liberal Party, under the guidance of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry, has moved much closer to a position of advocating that Canada stand away from its obligation to defend freedom. That is not a position which this Party or this Government defends. I think if the Hon. Member would like to have a debate on that in this country he will find most Canadians believe we have an obligation to stand up and defend freedom and not simply talk about it.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Mr. Speaker, any time the Minister wants to have a debate I will hire the hall and we will see what Canadians believe is the right way of defending freedom.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

## USE OF CANADIAN WATERS

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg—Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my supplementary to the Secretary of State who said he is defending Canadian interests. Why will he not answer the question as to whether Canada has an agreement with the U.S. on the use of our waters by its warships? Do we have such an agreement? Does Canada permit or go along with those initiatives? Has this country the capacity to detect when its waters are being used, or do we simply rely on information from other countries? We expect answers from the Government, not the cheap rhetoric of the Minister.

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member does raise important questions. It is too bad he waited until he was in opposition to do so. He and his colleagues did nothing about them when they were the Government of Canada.

The situation with which we are faced is that there are arrangements in place which allow the Government of Canada to know about the presence in our waters of any submarine or other craft of friendly or, indeed, other powers. Those arrangements are being respected. I do not propose to divulge them in detail in the House of Commons.

It is also clear that we do not now have the capacity to assert our sovereignty in the North that we should have. That is because the former Government backed away from the need to build a Polar Class 8 ice-breaker, which this Government is now going to build.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

• (1425)

## TRADE

## UNITED STATES DUTY ON CANADIAN SOFTWOOD LUMBER

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. The Prime Minister is quoted as saying this weekend: "The American lumber industry does not make decisions." Does the Government not understand the nature of the U.S. countervail system? Does it not realize that the U.S. lumber producers have to withdraw their petition and are using this leverage to increase the 15 per cent offer which we put on the table? They are the people in the no-lose situation as a result.

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know what selected quote the Hon. Member is using, so I cannot comment on that quote from the Prime Minister. However, we clearly understand how the U.S. trade laws on countervail affect us because the U.S. preliminary decision on lumber came down on October 16. The Hon. Member should know that there are only three solutions when faced with a countervail. The first is to pay it, the second is to seek to suspend it, and the third is to try to negotiate a solution. We are trying to negotiate a solution.

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister has in fact tried all three at different times.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY WHETHER GOVERNMENT HAS MANDATE TO INCREASE OFFER

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Considering the American position, does the Government have a mandate from Messrs. Bourassa and Vander Zalm to offer more than 15 per cent?

[*English*]

**Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the Government has been consistent and persistent in seeking every possible resolution to the American countervail action which we face against one of our biggest industries. We have sought every possible solution which would avoid a final determination that would affect our sovereignty and the right of the provinces to manage their own resources. We have been consistent and persistent in that.

The Hon. Member has repeatedly alleged that the Government is changing its position. I refer the Hon. Member again and again to the statement made in Vancouver as follows:

The Canadian Government has proposed an agreement that would lead to a complete withdrawal of the countervail action by U.S. lumber producers. In return, Canadian governments would agree to take measures to offset the effect of a 15 per cent countervailing duty.

Details of the Canadian measures will be disclosed following further consultations—

That is my answer, Mr. Speaker. I cannot and will not deviate from it.