

*Supply*

What conclusion does the Hon. Member come to on behalf of his constituents when he hears that the Canadian Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Gotlieb, on the instructions of the Minister for International Trade, presumably with the knowledge of the Prime Minister—although he claims to have knowledge of precious little these days—made a proposal to the U.S. administration that Canada and the United States should both appoint joint envoys to sit down and resolve our dispute about lumber? In the words of representatives of the U.S. industry and in the words of the President: "It must not only be resolved but be resolved before we submit to the Senate the results of the comprehensive negotiations". So it is not a question of believing or disbelieving the Minister for International Trade. It is a question of educating him, of making him aware, because he is obviously an innocent abroad, of the hard-nosed nature of these negotiations. The Minister could do with some direction. It is the same Minister who lost Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland in merely presenting a map of Canada. So it should not surprise anyone that he fails to understand the implications of the letter written by the President of the United States which states: "Before this Government shall ratify the agreement we must resolve in the interests of the United States, Canada's export of softwood lumber into our nation". If that is not a precondition, could the Hon. Member give me another word which Webster's might offer up in its place?

**Mr. Brisco:** What the Hon. Member for Humber-Port-au-Port-St. Barbe seems to ignore selectively is the fact that the issue of countervail, whether it is with forest products, steel, potatoes or berry crops, is frequently before us. It is an ongoing process. It has been there before, it is there now and, who knows, it may be there again down the road. Independent of any discussions, the Hon. Member should know that already a negative decision is on the horizon, in fact, even closer than that, with regard to the shake and shingle industry. However, the Hon. Member would not really be concerned about that because he has none of that cedar in his riding. He does not know what a cedar tree looks like. We in British Columbia do have some semblance of that industry and we know the impact of a negative decision.

Taken in the context of the Hon. Member's previous remarks with regard to the energy policy, to generic drugs and to the trade deficit, which he is obviously unaware we have in high tech, when one takes all of that into context, one must seriously question the allegations. Obviously, the Hon. Member was not in Alberta watching the deterioration of that whole province because of the National Energy Program. It was there. I saw it happen. I saw it go down the tube.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Sixty thousand jobs were lost.

**Mr. Brisco:** That does not make any difference at all to the Hon. Member for Humber—Porte au Port—St. Barbe. But I saw that happen and I saw the reversal. That reversal happened as soon as this Government was elected. It happened

even before we cancelled the National Energy Program in anticipation of its cancellation.

**Mr. Tobin:** Can I respond to that, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Brisco:** Let me now get on to the Hon. Member's—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** You had better get on with it very fast because he has only 30 seconds.

**Mr. Brisco:** This is the only country in the western world which shuts out the research component of the pharmaceutical industry to our detriment and adds to that a \$12 billion deficit in research and technology, which is growing at 15 per cent every year.

**Mr. Tobin:** I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker, but I want you to note that the Hon. Member spoke for some 4 or 5 minutes in asking his question.

Let me say that it is a sad day indeed when a Member of Parliament from Newfoundland who has in his riding pulp mills, not the cedar shakes which are in the Hon. Member's riding, has to stand up and speak on behalf of the Hon. Member's constituents because that Hon. Member insists on putting his loyalty to his Party and to its political agenda ahead of his loyalty and commitment to his constituents and the industry which sustains them. It is a sad day indeed when Members of Parliament from Newfoundland must stand up to ensure that the interests of the Province of British Columbia are heard echoing off the walls of this House because nothing but a whimper of support for the Government's failed position is being heard from Hon. Members from British Columbia.

The Hon. Member knows that the only way the U.S. administration could get the U.S. Senate Finance Committee to go ahead with free trade talks—and we barely made it with a vote of 10-10—was when the President told Senator Packwood: "I will fix up that problem you and some others have with the import of Canadian softwood lumber into the United States, and I will put it in writing". Some three weeks later, just a scant five days ago, the letter came. In the letter the President of the United States states that that matter must be resolved by bilateral negotiations, and if it is not resolved by bilateral negotiations, then he will take whatever actions are necessary that are consistent with U.S. law. That is the reality. The Hon. Member may not call that a sell-out, he may not say that his constituents' interests have been sold to get free trade talks going, but I say that.

I am sure British Columbians thank God sometimes that there are Members of Parliament who are prepared to stand and be counted for every part of Canada, not just for their own home province when other Hon. Members see it as their duty to stand behind their Party and not behind their own constituents.

The Hon. Member was sent here to be the voice of British Columbia in the House of Commons. The people of British Columbia do not want an apologist to speak for them. Do not ever forget that.