

Supply

supplies of red cedar which are desperately needed by U.S. producers, refusing to sell at a price that would keep U.S. shingles competitive. I have already explained to the House the reason for it. It is that they paid too much for the timber which they secured some years ago in the first instance. As everyone in the House will know, U.S. lumber producers have spent millions of dollars arguing that our stumpage is too low. It is ironic that their own system has failed to provide timber cheaply enough for shingles to compete with aluminum siding.

Is the opposition motion that we call off the trade talks the right answer? Is the NDP suggestion that we get out of any trade talks the right answer? I do not accept either suggestion; I do not accept either recommendation. Neither Canada nor the United States has ever promised to suspend all trade actions for the duration of these talks, and that is a promise I would not like to secure. The NDP talks about calling the United States and asking the President to suspend duties. However, are they also willing to tell Canadians that we will not move on dumping, which we have seen in the Fraser Valley and in the Okanagan, or on unfair subsidies, which we have also seen, particularly in the British Columbia agricultural community in terms of the Okanagan apples? Or, will they recognize that trade is a two-way street?

In the negotiations currently under way, an agreement to solve trade disputes is less damaging than any other option. The House should remember what these bilateral trade talks are about.

What are they about? First, they are about security. In the last two decades we have seen the world trading system fractured into trading blocs—the European Common Market, the South American, the Soviet, the Iron Curtain, the Australian, and the New Zealand. Canada is the only industrial country, except for the United States, which stands alone and competes alone. It is time to develop the strength, the vitality, the imagination, the technology, and the ability to work together.

When we say “compete”, what do we really mean? We mean sell.

Mr. Keeper: Sell out.

Mr. Brisco: A member of the NDP whom I cannot identify said: “Sell out”. That is very characteristic of the NDP philosophy, one that has failed to sell in Canada to this day.

Canada is a producer, and the world is our customer. Unfortunately, world over-production of commodities has produced a buyer's market. Prices are down and production is up. We cannot ask Canada to be the only industrial nation without security in these dangerous times.

When I talk about production being up, one sector which immediately comes to mind is the forest sector itself. From looking at the figures and at the statistics, we know that a traditional section of the U.S. market which we occupied at about 23 per cent or 24 per cent—and I am now referring to the softwood industry—now stands at around 34 per cent or 35

per cent. It is alarming but it is not surprising. It reflects the ability of British Columbia and the ability of Canadians generally to respond to a specific circumstance—the decadence of their own equipment and the economic and industrial response to gear up, to do better, and to compete. We have competed very successfully.

The second thing which the negotiations are all about is change. Every Canadian knows that technology and changing demand are causing and have caused radical changes over the last 15 years. They will continue to reflect and cause change. Hundreds of thousands of Canadians will find their current jobs changing; they may even disappear like the gandy dancer. No one can stop those changes, but we can manage the note and degree of change by protecting Canadians from the worst impacts; by establishing transition periods for industries, so that instead of workers being surprised one morning by lay-off notices, they will have adequate warning of major changes in the industry; and by providing programs to help them shift into a more secure line of endeavour.

Finally, trade negotiations are about opportunity. We believe Canadians can compete with anyone in the world. We have the educated workforce, the technology capacity, the social and commercial infrastructure to make our way. Canadians are remarkable people. Only the NDP would call us ordinary. Our success in so many industries proves just how competitive and combative we are and reflects the force and drive in the soul and body of Canadians.

The Americans are our neighbours and business partners, but we have our differences. The shingle case reminds us that it is not a game between friends; it is a matter of tough negotiations. Over the next two years we will face many disruptions and disputes in our trade with the United States. Any trade relationship which involves \$150 billion per year is bound to have disruptions and not be an easy ride.

I note that my time is up. I regret that, because there is much I would like to say about what has been contributed to the debate today. In conclusion, I should like to comment upon what was contributed by the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin), because I looked for a gem of wisdom, a suggestion of validity, or a worth-while proposal which we could consider. Neither he nor the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount (Mr. Johnston) offered a single suggestion of positive assistance. I think that reflects the very tone and nature of their contribution today. I consider it very unfortunate.

• (1750)

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member. I know the Member to be an honest Member. He has been a friend of mine for some years now. I fail, however, to grasp the meaning of his last sentence. He said that not one positive suggestion had been made in this debate today. I would argue with that. Suggestions were made. One of the most important was during Question Period and this morning when the Leader of the Liberal Party suggested that the first