

On the concern raised by the Hon. Member on the softwood lumber, I wish to quote from an article in *The Globe and Mail* on October 28 under the heading, "System of provincial levies to replace 15 per cent lumber tax". The article states, "The chances of rebuilding the Canadian share of the U.S. market on the basis of price competition are slim," the Minister of State for Forestry and Mines (Mr. Merrithew) said. "Even with the free-trade agreement," he told the council, "the best the industry can expect is to hang on to the U.S. business it has".

Those were comments from the Minister. So much for free trade, so much for its handling of the softwood and shingles issues, the Minister stated that as far as lumber was concerned, we will not gain from this. The best we can hope for is that we can hang on.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Read the whole statement. Tell the truth.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE RAISED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice (Mr. Grondin)—Youth—Plight of unemployed and homeless—Government position / Expectations of youth—Government position; the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine)—Trade—Free Trade—Position of socialist party in 1965; the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mrs. Dewar)—Trade—Service industry—Effect of Canada-United States trade agreement / Provincial jurisdiction over service jobs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CUSTOMS TARIFF

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Hockin that Bill C-87, an Act respecting the imposition of duties of customs and other charges, to give effect to the International Convention on the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System, to provide relief against the imposition of certain duties of customs or other charges, to provide for other related matters and to amend or repeal certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Privilege—Mr. Mazankowski

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to listen to the letter from the automobile parts manufacturers that was read into the record by my colleague from Regina. They urge the Government at least to postpone the implementation of this Bill, because they had not been able to discuss with the Government the tremendously adverse effects which these changes in duties will have on the industry in Canada, industry which they say employs 70,000 people.

I was interested because it is another example of the ideological blinkers and blindfolds worn by some people speaking for the Government, or its chief negotiator in the so-called trade talks—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member who, of course, will be allowed to continue his speech. But the House does have another matter to deal with at this time.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY CONDUCT

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the courtesy of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) in taking his seat.

As a consequence of a question of privilege raised by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) shortly after 3 o'clock until approximately 3.10 p.m., at which point the Hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party had the floor, I adjourned the matter until now.

The Hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party has the floor, and I will recognize the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

● (1610)

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege has been raised which touches for me a very important matter about Canadian politics. I want to speak briefly to it on the question of privilege.

As Leader of an opposition Party I had the occasion to oppose in public debate Mr. Trudeau as Prime Minister leading a Liberal Party, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) leading a Conservative Government, for a brief time the Right Hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner), and more recently the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney).

During all this time, as a man who went into national politics, not local politics, I have believed deeply in the well-being of Canadians from coast to coast. I have believed deeply in the obligations of Leaders of Parties and of all MPs to enter into passionate, reasoned debate about different approaches to Canadian politics and about different solutions.

However, I have opposed with all my being any concept of politics that I would ever say about a political opponent of