

*Oral Questions*

strongly in the House of Commons knowing that part of the challenge for Canadians on an issue of this kind was to make it clear that actions against Canada were going to evoke a response. We then proceeded with discussions as to whether there was compensation, and discussions as to whether there would be some opportunity for the President's action to be rolled back. Yesterday in the House of Commons my colleague, the Minister of Finance, indicated some economic responses that Canada was going to announce.

We naturally will continue to look for any way that we can find to relieve the situation that is causing so much difficulty in British Columbia including, as has been indicated, taking a look at the powers that are available to us under existing legislation regarding direct help to people who are affected by some temporary change of the kind involved in these tariffs.

## GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, will the Secretary of State be more specific? We are losing literally hundreds of jobs now by the day. On this issue of the countervailing duty on shakes and shingles, will he be specific in saying what actions the Government now plans to take to protect this industry in having that countervail lifted, or is the Secretary of State for External Affairs simply giving up on the shake and shingle question?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, we were not giving up on the shake and shingle question when the Prime Minister replied to questions in the House the day after the announcement was made.

We have not given up on it as is evidenced by the measures that my colleague, the Minister of Finance, announced yesterday.

**Mr. Blackburn (Brant):** Tough.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** We are continuing to seek, in discussions with the United States, any avenue that we might find open.

Let us be clear about this, Mr. Speaker. There are some very real limits in U.S. law. There are some political realities that are being faced by the American administration that will not be wished away by rhetoric. What we have to do is maintain the strong, steady position that this Government has taken since that measure was announced.

**Ms. Copps:** Christmas trees.

## CANADIAN TARIFF ON COMPUTER CHIPS

**Mr. David Berger (Laurier):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. It is not enough now to defend ourselves against the U.S. Government, we have to defend ourselves against our own Government. The Minister of Finance knows that we produce a negligible quantity of computer chips in Canada and that his tariff will increase costs to consumers and damage the fledgling Canadian industry

which uses those chips. By what convoluted logic did the Government decide to apply a tariff on computer chips?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear to most Canadians that a lack of a response to the United States Government on this particular issue would have been the wrong approach to take. It would have invited further action on the part of the United States Government had there not been a response. That is the nature of yesterday's announcement. I should also point out that later on that evening there was a very, very successful meeting between the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the provinces of Canada taking this whole matter one step further.

• (1430)

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

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** It was the success of that meeting which laid the groundwork for the negotiations which, hopefully, will lead us out of the problems which we are facing today. We will get a much better relationship in the—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Hon. Member for Laurier on a supplementary question.

[Translation]

## REASON FOR GOVERNMENT IMPOSING CERTAIN TARIFFS

**Mr. David Berger (Laurier):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are going to pick up the tab for this Government's response and stupid move.

Why impose a tariff which will increase the operating costs of a fledgling industry and, once again, make Canadians lose their jobs?

[English]

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, this is one of the costs of protectionism. The consumer in the United States is affected adversely as well.

**Mr. Boudria:** They will send the bill to you.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** This will affect trade between the two countries, but that is fundamentally why we are in these negotiations with the United States and fundamentally why the Prime Minister exercised his leadership to call the Premiers together to get on with the job of negotiating a better agreement.

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

## U.S. DUTY ON CANADIAN STEEL PRODUCTS

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Yesterday the U.S. International Trade Commission hit Canadian steel. Ipsco of Regina had a 41 per cent duty placed on its tubular steel product. So far the Americans have imposed trade restrictions on Canadian fish, cedar products, agricultural products, and steel. Tomorrow it might be Canadian softwood.