

Supply

bipartisan issue, whether we are talking about how it is being handled in the Senate or in the Congress. In relation to hogs and fish, we have seen how the United States plans to move. Our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) is down in Washington supposedly talking about free trade, freer trade or enhanced trade on these ever-shifting grounds of the trade issue. However, our American colleagues have advised us that they have no intention of moving with any speed on the issue of free trade. It will be several years in negotiations, as they pointed out. In fact, Sam Gibbons indicated that it will be 10 years, if they go ahead, before there is any substantial move in terms of free trade.

There are 300 protectionist Bills in the United States. The issues in respect of what is happening with Gibbons' Bill, Bonker's Bill, Larry Craig's Bill, Baucus' Bill, and all forestry related protectionist measures, should be receiving a much greater degree of attention by Members of the House in a multi-partisan way rather than the *ad hoc* approach of a little of this and little of that from our Embassy in Washington and through various trade connections in the United States.

I see the Minister for International Trade leaving the Chamber. I am sure he will be right back to hear me tell him very soon how to save the forest industry.

We have to get down to the brass tacks as a nation and deal with these protectionist Bills. The forest industry and its workers have spent \$10 million down in Washington fighting the Section 332 investigation, dealing with the Department of Commerce, dealing with Members of the Senate, dealing with Members of the Congress and trying to do the job alone, while the Government of Canada is sitting idly by.

Just a few days ago I attended a Canada-U.S. meeting and Senator McClure from Idaho gave me a letter. I think it is worth reading part of it into the record today because it gives Canadians some idea of how deeply felt is the issue of Canadian penetration of soft wood forest products into the U.S. market. It is dated February 27, 1986 and read in part as follows:

Dear Mr. Fulton:

As we gather this weekend to discuss issues of mutual concern, I wish to bring to your attention a problem that is straining the long-standing relationship between our two countries: the record level of lumber imports from your country that is severely depressing the timber industry throughout the United States.

Talks between your Government and mine on this issue do not appear to be moving toward any acceptable conclusion. The longer that such negotiations continue without any resolution, the more likely it becomes that the Congress of the United States will take action to restrict your country's exports of lumber.

● (1130)

The day before that, I think as you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, in the U.S. Senate some very hefty proceedings took place, all related to Canadian wood. I must say that I do not take too seriously this particular process that went on in the Senate. I think what the Senate is saying and the steps it is taking have to be taken in the context of the manoeuvring the Americans are taking us into in May. In May when they do drop the guillotine, which they tell us they are going to do, they will point back to these kinds of things and say that they

gave us lots of opportunity to do something. I know what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker, and I will be coming to that in a moment.

Let us take a look at what the special order in the Senate was on February 26, 1986. Senator Baucus was the first to speak. In a Special Order Session on Canadian Lumber Imports, he said:

Mr. President, today is a historic day for several reasons. One of them is because today the largest number of Senators are assembled here this morning in the history of the Senate to speak out under the special order section of the today's proceedings on one issue: that is, subsidized Canadian lumber imports. I repeat: The largest assembly of Senators to speak on one issue in the history of the Senate — 41 Senators.

It includes the leadership on both aisles: Senator Doyle, the majority leader; Senator Byrd, the minority leader.

It lists Senator Packwood, Senator Danforth, Senator Long and 11 members of the Finance Committee. He points out not only are there members from the Northwest, from Washington, Oregon, Idaho and California, but from every region.

We have that kind of information and material coming out through the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House, and we have a long-standing Bill of Sam Gibbons, which I hope I have a chance to deal with this morning because it proposes something that I think will be very difficult for us to deal with should the Bill be passed.

A year ago now, Dan Smith, the President of the Canadian Lumberman's Association, estimated the loss of 75,000 jobs should we cut to 25 per cent of the U.S. market, which was a proposal put forward by several members of the U.S. Congress.

Let us now take a look at how seriously the Government side takes this issue. I know the Minister of State for Forestry takes it seriously, but let us take a look in the Estimates at how serious is serious. On page 4-18 under the Canadian Forest Service, it reads:

Of particular concern during this period will be the current threat of United States' trade sanctions on Canadian lumber and the need to assure that access to this key market is not restricted. Approximately \$500,000 and 14 person-years will be used for this purpose in 1986-87.

That is the kind of bell-ringing support we see coming from the Government side when Canada's largest industry is under attack from the United States.

There are two real problems at issue here. There is the supply crisis on our side, and the issue of what the U.S. may, or hopefully may not do in May of this year. Let me quote again from the Minister's Estimates: It reads:

The lack of systematic forest management in the past has resulted in a depletion of the forest resource. Canada's total area of productive forest land is about 220 million hectares. Of this amount, approximately 12 per cent has not been adequately restocked and this is increasing by 200,000 hectares, or almost 1 per cent per year.

It goes on:

Canadian exports of forest products are highly concentrated in a few market areas with 72 per cent going to the United States, 12 per cent to the European Economic Community, and 6 per cent to Japan. Consequently, Canada would be particularly vulnerable to the imposition of protectionist measures which would jeopardize exports and the Canadian share of the international markets.