

passed it would not rise in the House to explain it. Rather, it would hope that the Opposition, especially when its numbers are limited as in the present House, would not be able to continue the debate at the end of its 10-minute speeches and, therefore, the whole issue would go to committee or elsewhere and not be in the public light. That is a concern of not only the Opposition but of many Canadians across the country.

Dealing with the legislation itself, I am concerned that there is so much doubt in the country and in the House about what it will do. We have already heard quotes from the infamous letter which American government officials sent to the American lumber industry. We have heard the interpretation which senior cabinet level people in the United States put on the agreement. We are told that the American government interpretation, which has been sent out to their industry, is not correct. We are told by government Ministers that it is not correct. That is not very informative. We would like more information from the Government as to what it believes the Bill means. People in our communities would feel a lot better if they knew that employees who will lose their jobs as a result of this legislation were eligible for government programs. If the Member wishes to speak, he will have an opportunity afterwards.

• (1230)

**Mr. Ostrom:** Tell us the truth then.

**Mr. Murphy:** As I was saying before I was interrupted by those who do not have the courage to speak, people in these communities will lose their jobs as a result of this legislation. Even the Minister admitted that people will lose their jobs. She said so with regret, but she admitted that. People, Madam Speaker, have no understanding of what is allowed and what is not allowed under this Memorandum of Understanding. We have read the American interpretation but we do not have the equivalent Canadian interpretation. Whether there are any disparities between the two views, we have no way of knowing. If I were a person who lost my job as a result of this legislation and the Memorandum of Understanding behind it, I would like to know what the forest companies can do, what the provincial Governments can do and what the federal Government can do and cannot do in order to give me a job, maybe not with the forest industry but perhaps a forest related job.

It is interesting to read the American letter. It points out that road construction and recreation efforts, if not tendered, cannot take place. In other words, people employed in northern Ontario or northern Manitoba who lose employment as a result of this Memorandum of Understanding may find themselves in a situation where they cannot work on Government or company projects which are set up to help resolve the unemployment problem. That is a serious concern, Mr. Speaker, and one that Government members and the ministry itself have not addressed.

Obviously, if we do have large pockets of unemployment in northern Saskatchewan, northern Ontario or elsewhere the

### *Softwood Lumber Products Export Charge Act*

provincial Government and unions affected will want something to help people. We do not want to see communities in northern Saskatchewan, northern Manitoba or elsewhere having large numbers of young people unemployed and being unable to do anything about it.

What happens if the Government of Manitoba decides—presumably Manitoba will have more money as a result of this legislation in the long run—it wants to expand the recreational network in northern Manitoba? According to the American interpretation that is not acceptable unless some funny tendering system is set up to allow many other people to make application for those same jobs.

We recognize the right of governments and we certainly recognize the right of employers to direct work toward a certain group of people within the population. Obviously if 2,000 people become unemployed in northern Ontario or 1,000 in northern Saskatchewan, northern B.C. or other parts of B.C. as a result of this legislation, we would have to look at projects to create employment. It does not make a lot of sense, Madam Speaker, to tender jobs if it really means that people in Vancouver, Winnipeg or Toronto will end up doing the work. That is the irony of it all.

We as a Government may have compassion, companies may have compassion but communities may have real worries as a result of this legislation. There may be a desire on the part of many of those components to do something for the unemployed but the Memorandum of Understanding, as the Americans understand it and as our Government has yet to refute it, may prevent it. For example, expansion of the recreation network and road construction, although providing necessary services to our communities, if that work happens to be perceived by the Americans as an undue benefit to people normally working in the wood industry it cannot be done. That is a real problem and a problem which the Government and its backbenchers should have the moral courage to address.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Madam Speaker, we are looking at Bill C-37 which has created a great deal of concern throughout the country. I have been hearing from many of my constituents concerned about Canadian sovereignty. This Bill, which the House has been asked to address, includes a Memorandum of Understanding whereby the Americans will look at the softwood lumber industry of Canada and have the right to determine what, how and where we are to make our determinations concerning the rates we pay for our softwood lumber.

We have been party to an agreement, through the Government's action while the Minister sunned herself on the beaches of Hawaii. The Minister, with her deputies signed an agreement which will have a very serious effect on the cost of the export of softwood lumber and will be detrimental to this industry in great measure. It is really the greatest sell-out in the history of our negotiations with the United States. It is the greatest betrayal of a major industry by a Minister who should be more responsible than she was.