

rescinded. I am literally terrified, like every other British Columbian or any Canadian, that if we are subject to this type of protectionism from the United States, which is our largest trading partner, we are in serious jeopardy. Our total economy is in jeopardy. I want to point out to the Hon. Member that it was the foresight of our Government and its initiative that have triggered these free trade talks. That is the only way out of this dilemma. That is why we cannot suspend the talks. But we must not start a trade war.

● (1600)

The Hon. Member questions the actions taken. If I were sitting in opposition I would be doing exactly what he is doing. However, I wish to point out to the Hon. Member that we have taken the strongest action that has ever been taken in an instance such as this one.

Mr. Fulton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order! The period provided for questions and comments has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): 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 Capilano (Mrs. Collins)—Tourism—Canadian Pavilion at Epcot Center; the Hon. Member for London—Middlesex (Mr. Clifford)—Hate Literature—Posted in Moscow for delivery in Canada; the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby)—Unemployment Insurance—Forget Commission—Request for interim report on pension income.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 82—CANADA-U.S. TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):

That this House urges that the Government press upon the Government of the United States the unanimous views of the House of Commons as expressed in its resolution of May 23, 1986, and insist that the United States rescind the 35 per cent duties on British Columbia cedar shakes and shingles and guarantee that similar measures or other possible trade action will not be applied to Canadian products in the future if the present comprehensive trade negotiations are to proceed.

Supply

Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by commending the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) for his very moving remarks about the real and present danger to the community of Mission and possibly other communities in the Fraser Valley becoming ghost towns if they lose one of their fundamental and vital industries such as the shake and shingle industry which we are discussing today. As representative of the neighbouring constituency I can tell the Hon. Member that many of the people living in my riding are employed in the industry, or at least were employed in the industry until now. I feel as deeply about the matter as he does himself. I do not intend in any way to be negative or purely oppositionist. On the contrary, I wish to be as positive and as constructive as I can.

In that connection I say to the Hon. Member that I was very concerned at the time of the airport expansion about which he spoke to have received a great many communications from residents of his constituency who felt that an insufficient number of environmental impact studies had been done before the contracts were let. These people requested a formal public hearing on what environmental impact studies had been done. They were concerned with the shortcomings of them. I see that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. McMillan) is in the House. I am sure he would join with those of us who nowadays are concerned about environmental impacts. It was in that connection that I took up the cause which many of his constituents presented to me at that time.

Toward the end of his remarks the Hon. Member said that he would be speaking to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) about the horrendous impact the U.S. tariff on cedar shakes and shingles will have. As my colleague from Skeena has pointed out, the Hon. Member is chairman of the Progressive Conservative caucus and is therefore an influential person with the Prime Minister. Had there been time I would have asked him why he has not already spoken to the Prime Minister. Given the consequences of this tariff, if we cannot have it revoked, why would the Hon. Member, as chairman of the caucus as well as a concerned British Columbian, not have said immediately to his Leader, the Prime Minister: "Given your good, friendly and warm relations with the President of the United States, will you phone him right away as a follow-up to the letter which was telexed to him?" I suppose that the President receives a million telexes a day. On Friday there should have been a follow-up in terms of a phone call to the President before the holiday weekend commenced. I say that because it is possible that the President might have been gone after Friday. Why did the Hon. Member not ask the Prime Minister in the most forceful terms possible to phone the President immediately?

Some of us think that the President does not think about Canada every time he wakes up in the morning. Hon. Members will remember that the Prime Minister once said that it would be a good thing if he were to do that. He does not think of Canada very frequently at all. He certainly was not thinking