

S. O. 29

Mr. Baker: I hope the Hon. Member will tell us what is on his mind. He has not spoken in this House in about 10 years. Maybe he will give us a speech in 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. Forrestall: Tell us about Rompkey.

Mr. Baker: The Government should address this issue before the House tonight by retaliating against the Government of Britain. If it were doing its job, it would tell Britain to forget about a nuclear submarine contract. It could spend the \$8 billion on daycare or allocate it to a special program for students who are trying to work their way through university.

Why is the Government not prepared to take this action? Perhaps it is because the friends of the Government are with the PR firms and lobbying firms that have contracts with the British. For example, GCI was recently hired to represent the Government of Great Britain in lobbying to sell its submarines. Perhaps that is why the Government will not deny the British any opportunity for a submarine contract.

My colleague who began the debate for the Official Opposition stated that the bottom line of the debate was that there should be a solution to the long-term problem. Perhaps we should be trying to develop a market here in Canada and to do with the pelts and fur what is being done in other parts of the world.

Perhaps the most disgraceful aspect of this debate is that there is no such thing as a leg-hold trap in use in Canada today. It is illegal in Canada and has not been used here in 10 years. Yet the Secretary of State for External Affairs stands in the House to say that he spoke to Sir Geoffrey Howe and that the Prime Minister spoke to Mrs. Thatcher about this problem. I hope he informs them that the leg-hold trap has been illegal in this country for the last 10 years.

I am sure that all trappers and all sensible people who know and are concerned about this issue are calling on the Government of Canada to say how it will retaliate if this resolution is passed by the British Cabinet.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to Hon. Members from all Parties. I just heard the unfortunate speech of the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker), who decided to interject with political rhetoric about a vital issue.

He brought the level of debate down to a new low with his typical "Twillingate-isms" from Newfoundland. It is unfortunate that he could not have used the same style and quality as the Member from the New Democratic Party.

My concern about this issue of humane traps relates to my lifetime of outdoor interests. It goes back to 1974-79, during the period that I served on the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. At that time the Standing Committee had the opportunity, on an annual basis, to review the report of the Federal-Provincial Committee for the Development of Humane Trapping and the development of a humane trap. That committee was a creature of the Liberal

Government. It laboured long and hard to invite the trappers of Canada to send in their inventions for a humane trap and have those inventions tested.

● (2140)

This is now operated by the Fur Institute of Canada. The traps are now tested in Vegreville, Alberta, at the Environmental Research Centre run by the Alberta Government. Therein lies one of the problems which we face. The annual budget for the research centre at Vegreville is around \$600,000. I suggest that if this nation has the capacity to put into space on a U.S. space vehicle something that is so vastly advanced in technology as the Canadarm, surely we have the inventiveness and the funds to develop a very precise and effective 100 per cent, "no problem whatsoever", humane trap.

In the minds of trappers there are, of course, precise traps for precise purposes for precise animals. In the minds of average persons, for example someone living on Bay Street or Bloor Street in Toronto, or anywhere else in a big city in Canada, a trap is a trap and an animal is an animal. They really do not make any differentiation as to how an animal is caught and how it dies.

What is the purpose of testing the mechanisms in Vegreville? Is it to provide a trap that will provide an instant kill for, say, a marten, a fisher, or a mink? What is instant? One minute, two minutes, a maximum of three minutes? That is pretty fast.

There are other traps such as the leg-hold trap. We heard the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate on the wrong track on that issue. Recently there has been some extensive testing conducted at the University of Minnesota on behalf of the Canadian Government and the Fur Institute of Canada to develop and determine the kind of pressures that there are on foxes in terms of emotional stresses and strains with the new type of leg-hold trap. Those tests have been very positive. Indeed, the tests show that any fox in a wild state has more pressures, more stresses, and different kinds of environmental strains on it which occur after the first 20 minutes in this revised, modernized, and scientifically developed leg-hold trap.

It cannot stop there. What this debate is really about is not what has happened today in Britain or is happening today in Britain; it is what is going to continue to happen and what has already gone on before, going back to the 1970s, going back to the birth, the spawning of the Brian Davies of this world and all of that ilk.

I refer to the animal rights peoples and the animal rights funds that sought millions of dollars and received millions of dollars in support of their efforts to bring a stop to the legitimate seal hunt of Newfoundland. What did they gain? They gained all kinds of gold to line their own pockets. There was not one receipt, not one financial statement, not one membership card—nothing. Ask Brian Davies. He will tell Hon. Members that it was the best thing he ever did in order to earn money. That is where that group is coming from.