

Oral Questions

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Some days are worse than others, Erik.

Mr. Beatty: Did you look behind you when you said that, John?

Mr. Ouellet: Come on.

Mr. Benjamin: Time's up.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the Hon. Minister wishes to answer that?

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Acting Prime Minister): I would like to respond to the question, Mr. Speaker, if I could be heard. I see the right hon. gentleman chortling with glee in his reaction to that question, but the question itself, surely, Sir, is the strongest possible indication of the need for an impartial investigation into the facts.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES NEGOTIATIONS—CANADIAN LUMBER EXPORTS

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of International Trade. As we predicted, after Senate free trade approval, at noon today U.S. lumber producers launched a new thrust to cut back Canadian lumber exports. Will the Government tell the United States that this new attack makes a mockery of the freer trade talks? Will it tell the United States that this destroys any good faith beginning in these free trade talks?

Hon. James Kelleher (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman I think the simple and short answer is that it is my understanding that no announcement will be made today by the U.S. lumber producers launching an attack, as the Hon. Member calls it, on our lumber industry.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): How about tomorrow?

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I want to put to the Minister as a question—are there finally going to be commitments on the part of the Government to get tough on this issue now, as it should have done long ago, and will it say to the United States that if there are such attacks made to get countervail, there will be no proceeding with free trade talks at this time?

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Did the CLC write that?

• (1440)

Hon. James Kelleher (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I think the record of the Government stands to

show that we have taken a very firm position in the lumber issue and that, indeed, we have protected the interests of our lumber producers.

If I may say so, the very threat of this type of action points out the reason why we need this type of trade agreement with the United States. I do not know why the Party of the Hon. Member wants to thwart that type of action by the Government to protect our lumber producers.

* * *

HEALTH

COQUITLAM AND VANCOUVER WATER SUPPLIES

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission—Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Given the conflicting reports which have been circulating on the contamination of the Coquitlam water supply reservoir regarding abnormally high levels of radiation, will the Minister tell the House what actions his Department has taken to assure that the Greater Vancouver Regional District receives adequate assistance to guarantee accurate testing of all water sources in the area and, in particular, in the Coquitlam reservoir?

Ms. Jewett: That's a dead story.

Mr. St. Germain: It's not dead in B.C.?

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Chairman—Mr. Prime—Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): This is not caucus!

Mr. Epp (Provencher):—I wish to say to the Hon. Member that there have been two tests done on the Coquitlam—the Leader of the Opposition laughs about these types of matters. Does he not take them as serious? Has he gone to levels which even he cannot describe?

An Hon. Member: You're pretty raw!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ouellet: This is a planted question, that is why we object.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the Hon. Minister want to finish his response, briefly?

Mr. Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, tests have been done on the Coquitlam water supply.

I wish to remind the Hon. Member that the levels which we use as acceptable were very, very low and very much on the side of prudence. We have done two tests. I think we can indicate that the first test was right at the level of some concern. The second test indicated that it is below that level.