

The present administration of the Conservative Government has simply not done the job. What other country in the world would not have a Minister directly responsible for the largest industry in its country? Only Canada. What kind of Cabinet would agree to only allow a very hard working Minister \$500,000 in his budget to deal with this issue? I have talked to the Minister's Department and he only received less than a half a person year to deal with this issue. I do not want to condemn carte blanche how many other Ministers are left in Cabinet, they have been dropping so fast. How many is it now, Mr. Speaker, 38?

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Reisman got \$500,000 for his office.

Mr. Fulton: That is right. That is just for office rent. Why would the rest of Cabinet not support someone who understands the industry and really wants to get out there and protect it? Why would the Government not give him any money or an opportunity to have his views brought to the United States where they could actually have some impact?

Let me deal once again with the issue of studies which the Government has not done and steps which should have been taken to deal with this issue. We have seen countervailing action effectively taken against hogs, blocking them from the U.S. market. We have seen that happen to our fish, 5.8 per cent on whole groundfish. We have seen this happen to berries, steel and all kinds of commodities. The Government has not responded, in my view, the way it should. Our workers in the forest sector, and the forest industry, have spent over \$10 million lobbying on this issue in Washington while our own Government has done almost nothing. It certainly has not given the right kind of tools to our trade consulates to use in the United States. Why would our Government not do any studies on what kind of effect different options which a large trading neighbour was planning to take against it would have? Why would it not undertake an evaluation so it could determine what kinds of steps it should be taking itself?

I suppose the envoy proposal will go ahead. It's a way of buying a little time. Someone will be appointed and that person will meet with a well known American. They will drink a little champagne and eat some caviar and agree they are good pals. Our envoy will come back and make some kind of proposal in order to buy a week or two weeks of time. But the President of the United States has made it clear to the U.S. Senate Finance Committee, and to Republicans and Democrats in the United States, that there is a timetable on this issue. The countervailing duty process started yesterday.

The Minister says the envoy is going to go to Washington tomorrow. He sent telegrams out to the Forest Ministers last night. That is all very marvellous. But the fact is, if you want to know what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, this process may go ahead through the existing countervailing process because there have already been changes. Since the administration has accepted it, it may move along fairly quickly. It may be moved forward and they may come up with a countervail. However, if those key people such as Packwood and

Supply

Gibbons, and others in the United States, do not think going that countervailing route will be significant enough to protect them from the politics about which I am speaking, the grassroots politics—they have large amounts of unemployment in their states, although it is nowhere near as high as what we have or have had in recent years as a result of technological change—the Gibbons Bill will move forward. It is an omnibus bill directed to resource subsidies. It will have direct support from the President, the administration and the Republicans. It already has the support of most of the Democrats. So those are the two scenarios. There is the countervail scenario, or a countervail approach through new legislation, which seems to be the preferred route.

● (1250)

I must say that I was sorry to hear the speech by the Minister for International Trade. I think this issue is far more significant and far more ominous than his speech writer obviously felt last night while he was writing it. I hope that the Minister of State for Forestry will have more to say on the dilemma in which we are now involved.

Even the head of the Canada Lumbermen's Association predicts that 75,000 more jobs will be lost. These are the jobs of buckers, fallers, skidder operators—people who work in the bush. I am not talking about secondary and tertiary industry. We are facing a very dire dilemma. Either the President of the United States has gone back on his word or our Prime Minister has not told all. In either case our forest industry faces a very serious and debilitating situation with a near 30 per cent countervail proposal coming through the Department of Commerce.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Sarnia—Lambton (Mr. James).

Mr. James: Mr. Speaker, I guess I am a little confused as to where the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) is coming from. He seems to be arguing in many different ways. First, it is as if we had never heard that the U.S. industry has maintained that our stumpage policies were not advantageous. That is not new. It has been going on for years. It is something about which we have fought. To listen to the Hon. Member it is almost as if the Government brought it on. The Hon. Member seems to be tying this matter to the bilateral trade negotiations. Just last night the Deputy Chief Negotiator, Mr. Ritchie, reconfirmed that it is a very separate and distinct negotiating situation. It has nothing to do with the preparation for bilateral negotiations.

The Hon. Member refers to going down to the U.S. and having consultations. Yet he does not seem to want us to consult with the U.S. and negotiate. The Hon. Member cannot have it both ways. Perhaps it is because I am new here and the Hon. Member has been here longer than I that there does not seem to me to be any direction to all this.