

Mr. Speaker, the producers in Canada expect to be able to produce for the entire Canadian market. If they are precluded from producing for a province—

Since Algoma produces only 13,000 tons, and Canadian consumption is 17,000 tons, obviously Algoma cannot produce for the entire Canadian market. Algoma has already put western fabricators on an allocation system, thereby permanently ensuring they cannot supply that market. Will the Prime Minister now recognize the reality of the regional market that exists in British Columbia and give assurance that the anti-dumping duty will not be reinstated at the end of this month?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Finance dealt with that part of the question yesterday. I can repeat to the hon. member that when we suspended the anti-dumping duties some months ago, it was a temporary measure made with the agreement of British Columbia and other provinces which expressed satisfaction with it in order to permit all parties to readjust to the current situation. I believe the answer I gave yesterday had to do with a question posed in economic terms. I indicated that surely it is the objective of producers in Canada, including Algoma, to try to produce for the entire Canadian market. Because they were not doing that some months ago, we did allow for a period of readjustment. Whether this period should be prolonged or not is something to which the Minister of Finance says he is giving consideration.

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that if the province of British Columbia was in favour of it, they submitted a lengthy brief to the tribunal opposing it. How long will fabricators in British Columbia have to wait, or are they even going to be in existence by the time Algoma optimizes its production so they can be supplied? In the meantime, will the federal government do something to provide a supply for these fabricators so they will not be run out of business?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is repeating the kind of question which was put to the government as the result of a situation which developed more than six months ago. We acted, at that time, in a special or temporary way in order to permit the various parties to adjust to the current reality. Yesterday, the Minister of Finance again said in this House that he would examine the situation to see if there had been adjustments and whether further measures were needed.

\* \* \*

## COMMUNICATIONS

### SUGGESTION OF BELL CANADA FOR NATIONAL CONFERENCE

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Communications. In view of the many and different communications problems which are ending up in the courts, before the CRTC or before the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission—quite a few of them involving Bell Canada—has the minister considered, and does she think there is any merit in the suggestion of the

## Oral Questions

president of Bell Canada, Mr. de Grandpre, that it is time for many of these problems to be brought together under one roof at a national communications conference? If she thinks it has any merit, what has she done about it?

**Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, there is always merit in getting all people concerned in the same room in order to discuss pertinent problems. I have looked at Mr. de Grandpre's suggestion. The provincial ministers of communications have also asked me to meet on the particular problems which are currently preoccupying the industry. There is some chance that the interested parties, the telephone company and the other carriers, might be included in that meeting.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I was most interested in the minister's reply because there seems to be a problem of communication here in the chamber, mechanically anyway, judging by the noise we hear from outside. I wonder if it is sabotage by one of the communications people. Be that as it may, I was interested in the part of the minister's answer that I could hear.

Do I understand that she is giving serious consideration to a national communications conference so that the problems of interconnection, terminal connection, Telesat, earth station policy and many other diverse problems can be brought under one roof, so we can start to get a coherent policy in such a vital field rather than having decisions made on a piecemeal basis by regulatory bodies and/or the Supreme Court of Canada?

**Mrs. Sauvé:** Mr. Speaker, regardless of the problems we have had with communication in this chamber, I have always managed to have priority over any means of communication that we have. As to the question put by the hon. member, that agenda is quite an important one. It spans the complete range of activities of the whole of my department. If the hon. member is thinking specifically, because it is the first thing he mentioned, of interconnection, I remind him that this matter is presently before the CRTC for examination. It would, therefore, be quite improper for me to comment on it. However, the case which is presently being studied is very important. I shall look into it further to see whether there is any possibility of developing policies regarding this important question.

\* \* \*

## INDUSTRY

### VISIT OF METRIC COMMISSION TO YUKON

**Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Why did the Metric Commission fly to Whitehorse, in the Yukon, last week for routine working meetings on the metric system in the meat packing industry of Canada? In particular, how can the minister justify the expenditure of some \$20,000 for this two-day trip, particularly in view of the fact there is no meat packing industry in the Yukon?