

*Government Orders*

particular area is protected. I refer, of course, to the decision by this government to sell out to the Americans on the softwood lumber tariff, the Memorandum of Understanding, as it is known.

That has created havoc in the forest industry. Perhaps something is getting through over there because in the summer 1989 issue of the *Weststar Timber Magazine* the Minister of State for Forests said: "It is not at all a desirable situation that a foreign jurisdiction would determine whether or not we are properly managing our forests or charging an adequate economic rent". I wonder if Pat Carney is listening today because of what that has done in our province in terms of the additional measures taken by the province of British Columbia. I guess we will see if the current government is still in office in the near future. In any case, that Memorandum of Understanding has dealt a stealthy blow to our industry in Canada.

After spending some time thinking about this issue and researching it, it is my view that if we believe in this country that we are right, that we have managed our forests as best we can, and we have acknowledged where we have had problems, then we should rip up the Memorandum of Understanding and be prepared to defend our forest practices at whatever level is needed so we do not sell out our forests, like the Conservative Party did, again. We must ensure that we manage our forests and not someone else in another country telling us how to run our forest policy in this country.

The Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group met last June, discussed some other trade issues and the plywood standards dispute. I gather some progress was made. No progress was made in the softwood lumber tariff which shows that more work must be done. I know members will likely support our amendment to have a full-time forest trade commissioner deal with these issues to ensure that our forests are represented properly at the trade level.

Just recently over the summer, on the decision that was taken by the Los Angeles City Council on our cedar shakes and shingles, where were the government members? Perhaps they were on holiday somewhere. It took four weeks to finally get a word from this government about its intention to assist the industry in this area. Now workers are helping to contribute to a campaign to ensure that our cedar shakes and shingles go into that American market, a major market for our shakes, that

the decision can be overturned, and the product that our people ship into the United States is recognized to be the valuable product that it is.

Earlier this summer, my colleague and I travelled into the Maple Ridge area and visited a shake and shingle mill. It was educational. In fact, my colleague suggested that the Minister of State for Forestry join her in a tour of one of those mills so he could get a first-hand understanding of what the decisions and the lack of direction by this government has done to the people who work in that industry. He has gone as far as to say that we do not have the people, if you can just throw money at problems. We are not suggesting that we throw money at problems. I suggest that we have many people prepared to make their contribution to forestry in this country. With proper spending, with proper and adequate information and decision-making early we can do something about it.

Given the incredible demand that we will have on our forests for the various products we produce, we face an incredible demand for increasing the annual allowable cut in our provinces. The current debate in different parts of this country is over preserving parts of our forest to ensure that they are there for future generations and to meet, where we can, the challenge that the Brundtland Commission on sustainable development identified which is the 12 per cent needed. They are major challenges which can be met with this legislation and with the debate around this department.

I am concerned over a recent interview with the minister stating that the Minister of the Environment can intervene in his department. Let us see what that means. I am concerned that if we do not have the debate about forestry on the Forest Department's terms in our legislation that we are talking about today—and will be dealing with in the committee—who knows what this department is going to end up as? It will not have the strong mandate that I think it needs.

We will have these incredible conflicts. Many members know that the debate is ongoing now in terms of our old growth forests primarily on the coast of British Columbia. There is a debate in northern Ontario. What we can do is to assist and provide the leadership and the opportunity where possible at the federal level to work with provinces and with those groups involved to ensure that proper decisions are made. These decisions involve process. Often one will hear politicians talk about process, because it is a convenient way to avoid taking a