

her Party not in support of increased stumpage fees, something which at long last will perhaps put the necessary money into reforestation and silviculture? After all, stumpage rates are under provincial jurisdiction, they are not something over which we as a federal Government have any jurisdiction.

● (1210)

Clearly these are all moves designed to assist and promote the forest industry in British Columbia and to create the very jobs the Hon. Member has correctly said are needed. However, the views she presented this morning seemed to go contrary to known fact and the activities of the Government.

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for his questions. Indeed, the reforestation agreement is an important one. Compared with what was done in the past when the forest industry was basically ignored both by the companies themselves and by the Liberal Government, this is a step forward. It is just that because of this long neglect, so very much more is needed, and I am sure my hon. friend would agree.

The Hon. Member said that the Americans are not interested in a sectoral approach. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker. What the Americans are trying to do is pick off one sector after another. That is what they are doing and that is what they have been doing. That is what we must not let continue. It is like we are giving them the opening to pick sectors off. We have to get in there ahead of them. We have to know our own position on each sector without simply allowing the Americans to pick each of them off.

Finally, on the subject of stumpage fees, I said that for years we had wanted to have the entire stumpage system looked at. We think it has inherent deficiencies. One of those is fees. I think it is a pity that only the question of fees has been addressed, particularly since fees were not found to be a subsidy in the 1983 ruling of the ITC.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I am just a little bit confused. I am not sure what the Hon. Member is saying in terms of the NDP position. Is it the NDP position that we should condemn the agreement which may or may not be reached in these negotiations before we see it? That seems to be the position of the CLC. That position is that any kind of new trade arrangement with the United States which might be agreed to by negotiators on our behalf and on its behalf should be condemned and condemned outright before anyone has seen it.

It seems to me to be perfectly logical to hold our fire on whether or not to accept an agreement until we have seen what it says. Is the Hon. Member saying that we should condemn it because somehow, in her mind, she thinks the process is flawed and therefore a flawed process cannot produce a good result? Certainly in this Chamber we see many flawed processes. We see many bad results but we see many good results coming out of flawed processes. Is she condemning the process or is she condemning the potential agreement before we see it and before we have had a chance to vote on it in this Chamber?

The Address—Ms. Jewett

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, we do have some doubts about what might come out, particularly because if the so-called free trade negotiations result in some kind of an agreement and the Americans continue to insist on having the power to counter-vail, I do not see that we will be very far ahead in the forest industry or any other industry. How can we wait to hear of the private negotiations on this so-called free trade deal? They are going on in private. We do not know what is going on. In the interim, the Americans are taking all these protectionist actions. The Hon. Member is asking me if I question the process. What I am questioning is his position which seems to be one of waiting until the negotiations are all finished. We cannot wait. We simply cannot wait.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will know that under the GATT the Auto Pact was an exception as a sectoral agreement. We were given a special exemption. I wonder if the Hon. Member thinks that the sectoral approach favoured by her Party is consistent with the GATT. A GATT official told me that he doubted very much that we would ever again be given an exemption for an Auto Pact agreement between Canada and the United States. I wonder if the Hon. Member really believes that it would be possible to get another sectoral agreement through the GATT while being consistent with GATT which, as she knows, would certainly not be possible.

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I think the auto agreement is entirely different and the kinds of guarantees that were given under the auto agreement for the production of automobiles are entirely different from those in an agreement that would be negotiated in the forest industry. The agreement that is to be negotiated in the forest industry would presumably be an agreement relating to market sharing and matters of that kind. I do not know that one would even ask for the kinds of built in guarantees that are in the automobile agreement as I understand the Auto Pact. I really do not think the question of a negotiated agreement would violate GATT. Indeed, the Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney), the Hon. Member's own colleague, is already, in a sense, in negotiations. It is just a little late. Is she violating GATT?

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the presentation made by the Hon. Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) but I am rather curious about the amount of time the NDP are giving in the House to the provincial election in British Columbia as compared to the time given to federal business. I listened carefully to what she had to say about the election in British Columbia. Being a Conservative from British Columbia, I can take a very detached viewpoint from the sidelines. I wonder if the Hon. Member would agree with me that putting Mr. Skelly up against Mr. Vander Zalm is about the worst mismatch we have seen since Buddy Baer fought Joe Louis for the championship.

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Hon. Member asked that question. I think there are people in public life who occasionally choke up when they are faced with a gaggle of television cameras and a hustling, pushing horde of