

the case in matters closest to the essence of our lives, family life poses intriguing paradoxes for us.

The family is an experience common to us all but we have traditionally been very hesitant to intervene in destructive family situations for fear of interfering with matters of a very personal and private nature. The family is a basic unit of our society and yet we still have much to learn about its dynamics. We should expect that the family as a basic social element will reflect the earliest consequences of social adaptation and change. However, our response as a society to new and different family structures has often been less than supportive. For all the importance we attach to family life, how many of us can truly say that we devote as much energy to our families as we do to our jobs and public activities?

The attention the Canadian family is now receiving thanks to motions and resolutions like the one put forward by the Hon. Member for Scarborough West is no matter of expediency or ideological convenience. The past two decades have been especially hard on the family unit as we once perceived it in its traditional terms. The capabilities of the family for self-reliance and protection have been seriously challenged by the complexity and gravity of today's problems. However, at the same time, families in difficulty have available to them a wide and growing range of support resources offered through Government and an extensive system of voluntary and other services and informal—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member.

[Translation]

I must regretfully interrupt the Hon. Member. The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. We shall deal now with the proceedings on adjournment motion.

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 46 deemed to have been moved.

TRADE—CANADA—UNITED STATES NEGOTIATIONS—LUMBER EXPORTS. (B) SUGGESTED TRADE PROMOTION IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Ernie Epp (Thunder Bay-Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to say something more about concerns which were expressed in questions I asked on October 2, 1985. These were questions which reflected concerns expressed by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr.

Adjournment Debate

Fulton), in various context, with respect to the threat to Canadian softwood lumber exports to the United States.

In Question Period on October 2 I focused on two different aspects of the problem. The first had to do with the suggestion of the U.S. Ambassador that Canada might consider a voluntary restraint on exports of softwood lumber to the United States. The second dealt with lobbying efforts which were required in the U.S.

My suggestion to the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) that the call for voluntary restraint on exports represented a suggestion of illegal activity by Canadian softwood lumber exporters was confirmed, in a sense, a few days later by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Weiner). He said that his understanding was that the Ambassador had expressed a personal view. He then went on to say that any such action might well have serious anti-trust implications and that these are considerations which he was certain would be taken fully into account by the Canadian industry.

Representatives of the Canadian industry in northwestern Ontario were certainly not in any doubt about these matters when, together with my colleague from Skeena, we met with them a few days before these discussions in the House of Commons. At those meetings we considered the importance of softwood lumber exports to northwestern Ontario. We were impressed and astonished—staggered even—to realize that 80 per cent, and more, of the lumber production of northwestern Ontario went across the border to the United States. We realized then that the threat to these exports resulting from the action of Congressmen in the United States was a threat which could really devastate employment in the industry in northwestern Ontario.

Thus we had the very best of reasons in our communities, in the City of Thunder Bay and in the surrounding towns where the lumber industry is so important, for emphasizing to leaders in industry and in unions to do everything they could to urge the Government of Canada to perform that lobbying effort which only the Government can carry on but which is so imperative.

I was pleased to receive a response from the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs with respect to the matter which suggested that the Government realized the importance of the matter and that it was, in fact, mobilizing an effort in various parts of the United States to form a coalition. I was also pleased to see later in the fall that success was attending these efforts and that a coalition had been gotten together. It was comprised of people involved in the transportation of the lumber and those who wanted to use it without having to pay the price increases. Those in the southern United States who are prepared to pay a premium for spruce, pine and fir lumber, which they use for framing purposes in house construction as opposed to using southern yellow pine which is simply not as good also, responded to the Canadian Government urging it to act in the U.S. to ensure that protectionism did not triumph.