

S. O. 29

extremely strong message to the British Parliament about the concern that all Canadian parliamentarians have with respect to this issue. It is my feeling that the Canadian Government should consider asking for, minimally, a postponement of this legislation so that there will be an opportunity for Canada and Britain to discuss it further, and to negotiate some alternatives. My understanding is that it is generally accepted that when countries are about to bring in legislation which may affect trading items with other countries that they consult those countries. My understanding is that Canada was not consulted in this case. I think that we have some ground to stand on to ask, at least minimally, for a postponement of the bringing in of this order.

There is an organization called the International Trapping Standards Organization to which Canada and 17 other countries belong. It seems to me that it is an appropriate forum for those who are concerned about trapping methods to participate and to get agreements among countries about the kind of trapping that would be acceptable. Britain is neither a member nor an observer of this organization. As I said to Trade Minister Alan Clark in Britain, this seems to me to be a responsible alternative.

There are other measures which I think the Canadian Government must consider. I suppose that we could label British products to the effect that their manufacture contributes to pollution. But it becomes a very spiralling effect. I am not sure how useful it is. I suppose that one could get into that type of *quid pro quo*.

There have been suggestions particularly by more private organizations and individuals in Canada with respect to boycotts of goods, trade retaliation and so on. It is clear that those measures would have to be undertaken extremely carefully and within the context of over-all trade relations. Obviously, the United Kingdom is one of our favoured trade partners. We would like to continue in that way. But some form of countervail would certainly have to be at least looked at, I would suggest.

One of the things that the Canadian Government could most usefully be doing is to speak to some of the very large British investors in Canada. I had the opportunity to speak to one of the managers of Canada British Petroleum which has very large holdings in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, as well as in other parts of Canada. I did so to inform him about this legislation and about some of the reaction that his company might get when it begins to deal with, perhaps, aboriginal groups with respect to leases and so on. This is a measure which I hope the Canadian Government would consider to use in order to inform some of our larger British investors.

While this is an extremely important opportunity this evening to discuss this issue and to bring up the points—and all Members have an opportunity to speak on it to express their concerns and to send this extremely strong message to the British Parliament—I hope that the Canadian Government

will be able to present us with some concrete steps that it will be taking in this area.

In conclusion, I would say that we must do something as a Parliament. The matter is urgent. The Hon. Member for Timiskaming (Mr. MacDougall) mentioned the effect on individuals. This is extremely important, whether it is the person who works with a furrier, or a furrier, a trapper or a farmer. If we are not able to do something about this, what will we tell people such as Alarja Harper who is in his seventies now, an Indian from the Yukon who gave up his Indian status to go to fight in World War II for the freedom of this country and for the freedom of Britain? When he came back, he did not have a vote. He did not receive land as a veteran. He returned to trapping, and he is still trapping. What do we tell Elijah Smith? What do we tell Charlie Peter Charlie, also in his seventies who is from Old Crow? He and his grandsons continue each year to participate in this. What do we tell them if we let it go by? We cannot let it go by.

● (2040)

What do we tell the many, many families? I spoke to a number of them this past weekend in my riding in the Yukon. Those families are reliant on this industry both for their economic welfare, their cultural and traditional heritage, and for their family. In several instances that I am aware of, it is interesting to note that the courts, in lieu of sending someone to prison, have looked at the particular case and decided that prison will not work for that particular person. What we will do is send this person out on a trap line with his uncle or his cousin. This will be a way to teach him a skill, to teach him how to work, and it will be culturally appropriate for that person, and it will contribute to society.

In conclusion, this is an extremely important discussion tonight. I hope that we can see some concrete action taken out of it, and that it will send the strong message that we wish to to British Parliamentarians.

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane—Superior): Mr. Speaker, I am personally pleased that the two applications for this special debate were allowed this afternoon by His Honour. I wish to commend my two colleagues, the Hon. Member for Timiskaming (Mr. MacDougall), and the Hon. Member for Yukon (Ms. McLaughlin) who were responsible for initiating this debate. In participating in this evening's debate, there are three points that I wish to make, time allowing.

The first of these points is that the Canadian fur industry is a legitimate industry. It is unjust and it is wrong that it should be crucified by the misguided animal rights movement which is so active in the United Kingdom and other parts of Europe.

The second point is that the fur industry is of particular and special interest, concern, and importance to the aboriginal peoples of Canada, as well as aboriginal peoples elsewhere, such as Greenland and the State of Alaska.