

*Supply*

out the parameters of this problem. We can deal with it in rational terms. We can dredge up the report of the International Trade Commission, which properly investigated the whole matter and came to a determination that, indeed, there was no unfair subsidy existing. We could set aside complaints by the U.S. industry and legislators that Canada's forest lands are owned by provincial Governments and that that constitutes some kind of subsidy by pointing out that that is a jurisdictional question and a question of sovereignty.

We could look at the position of the Canadian dollar vis-a-vis the American dollar and see logically that that has given us an increased opportunity these last number of years to export our products, be it lumber, fish or iron ore. As legislators we could agree that the Bills that are being put forward by Mr. Weaver and Mr. Bonker and others are not well founded in fact. They are a political response to their constituents at home. They represent shortsighted one-dimensional trade position that ultimately could have the kind of ramifications that the Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) suggests, that is, a trade war, the restriction of products from U.S. into Canada and from Canada into the U.S.

What the House needs to do, and what the Government of Canada needs to do, is continue to make the U.S. administration aware that we view this issue as not just a serious issue, but an extremely critical issue in this country. It is an issue for which there can be no negotiations in this country. We are not prepared to trade off 75,000 jobs in the forest industry to get a free trade agreement. That is not on the table.

● (1200)

In addition to doing that, we have to go to the constituents of those legislators who have put this draft legislation before the U.S. Congress. If the Government of Canada is not prepared to put its money where its mouth is and allow a non-governmental coalition to do an education job, because that is what we are talking about, then it will have refused to fight the first battle and will have lost the war.

The Canadian forest industry, in its contribution to our balance of trade, represents more than the fishery, the agricultural industry, the mining industry and, now more than ever, the oil and gas industry put together. Directly and indirectly it represents one in 10 jobs. Once you move away from the manufacturing belt along the border, particularly in Ontario and Quebec, the forest industry becomes the backbone of regional and local economies. Those who are listening to this debate and who live in the pulp and paper town of Stephenville in my riding, or in the pulp and paper town of Kenora in northern Ontario, or similar towns in Quebec, should not kid themselves that this is primarily a British Columbia issue. It is not. The workers of British Columbia are on the front line of a trade protectionist stance being adopted south of the border. If that stance is not blunted now, then those of us who make our living in the pulp and paper industry outside of British Columbia are going to be next. If they can rationalize this stance based on the stumpage system in this country, provincial ownership of forestry lands and a low Canadian dollar, the

Americans will be very quick to come to the conclusion they can rationalize restricting all other Canadian forestry products in the same manner.

This House needs to adopt a non-partisan approach to this issue. As I say, I believe the Government was slow—perhaps many of us were slow—in recognizing just how serious this issue is. We were slow in recognizing just how determined this lobby south of the border is, just how bereft of real information American citizens are about the consequences of setting up these kinds of trade barriers.

Having said that, surely it is the responsibility of the Government to provide the means, that being money, and the responsibility of all parliamentarians to provide the support, for representatives of this industry to go down to the U.S. and begin the intensive education process among American citizens so that they can take the political pressure off the legislators who are putting these Bills forward. The stark reality is that those legislators fear for their political lives. This legislation is not motivated by or grounded in a sound trade position. It is motivated by and grounded in a desire on the part of those U.S. legislators to be re-elected. Those of us who have had the opportunity to go to Washington know that. They acknowledge it privately.

I view this issue as being important enough that I would rather spend my time in this House endorsing a Government policy to provide the means required. I understand the nervousness on the part of the Government about being accused of politicking in another country's jurisdiction and so on. Yet the previous U.S. Ambassador, Mr. Robinson, was never reluctant to let Canada know how the U.S. administration, let alone the American people felt about FIRA, or our defence policy, or our providing incentives to business, or our regional economic policies. If the representative of the U.S. President in Canada can exercise that right, sometimes on matters that were purely domestic Canadian issues, then surely the Minister of International Trade would agree that on a matter which directly impacts on Canada and as many as a million Canadians we ought not to be nervous or reluctant to make the means available to go directly over the heads of the U.S. administration and legislators to the American people. We have to make them fully understand the consequences of an attempt by the U.S. Congress to pass this kind of legislation.

There is a constituency which exists in the U.S. and which can assist us in making our case. There is a coalition of U.S. home builders, a number of newspapers, unions, railroad companies and others who have already announced their opposition to this kind of trade legislation. We have other allies there. It is the job of the Government, in a more substantial way than has been the case, to go down and work with that coalition. It is our job to put whatever resources are necessary at the disposal of an appropriately developed organization to make Canada's case. If we do not, the lumber industry in this country will suffer the same irrational fate as the seal hunt. There is not a thinking, honest Member with an ounce of integrity in this House of Commons who truly believes, given the facts, that the seal hunt had to be banned to save the