

*Supply*

● (1510)

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to what my hon. colleague had to say. He did mention that he did not want to comment on whom he was waiting for. Would he mind commenting on the fact that he is not waiting for us?

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** You took the words out of my mouth.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let me first say to the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) that there is no question of privilege. The rules require something to be done, that is, that Private Members' time not occur on a day when there is an Opposition motion under Supply.

I may say to the Hon. Member for Skeena that, with the exception of the scheduling which is now known somewhat in advance, it was always the practice, and has been for many years, that when an Opposition day has bumped a Private Members' motion, the motion has been moved to the bottom of the list; then on subsequent days under the old procedures the Table would try to find slots for those motions. What has changed in that sense is an attempt to schedule. There is the other problem relating to the matter, as to what happens on days when there is not notice, but that is not a question of privilege.

I think the Hon. Member has a grievance with regard to the rules, but when things fall between two stools we have tried to find solutions. The Chair has indicated before that it is hoping to find a solution to these problems by consensus or by an agreement between the House Leaders. The Chair would prefer to find a solution in that way, since that normally better represents the will of the House. That is what the Chair is waiting for. Let me conclude, however, by saying that there is no question of privilege.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

#### ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 82—FORESTRY PRODUCTS—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT CANADIAN INDUSTRIES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Axworthy:

That this House condemns the lack of care and concern for workers in the cedar shakes and shingles industry and in the softwood lumber industry shown by the Prime Minister in his letter to President Reagan, in which he clearly put his personal interests ahead of those of working Canadians and calls upon the Government to take immediate action (1) to assist workers in the lumber industry and in the shakes and shingles industry by invoking the *Employment Support Act*; (2) by assisting in every way the softwood lumber industry in making the Canadian case before the United States International Trade Commission; (3) to ensure that proper time is given to make this case by, if necessary, obtaining extensions to the hearing time; (4) and by initiating proper and effective action under the rules of GATT to ensure that this matter is satisfactorily considered by the international trading system.

**Mr. Speaker:** Let us resume debate. When the House recessed at 1 p.m., I think the Chair had recognized the Hon. Member for Timmins—Chapleau (Mr. Gervais)

**Mr. Aurèle Gervais (Timmins—Chapleau):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the debate this afternoon on a matter of vital importance to Canadian forestry workers.

[*English*]

The motion before the House today deals with issues of over-riding importance to our nation and its future, and we can only reflect with sadness on the Opposition Party's willingness to try to seize partisan advantage from the hardships of the Canadian workers. At a time when the international trading environment upon which our country depends for its prosperity is crumbling under the blows of protectionist pressures in every nation, the Opposition is telling Canadians that efforts to improve our relationship with our closest trading neighbour are destined to fail.

It is also of particular interest that the motion calls for the Government to invoke the Employment Support Act to assist workers in the lumber industry, ignoring the fact that no tariff has yet been imposed against Canadian softwood lumber. While some people may be eager to tell Canadian workers that they are doomed, it is worth noting that Canada has been successful in withstanding protectionist efforts in the United States against the sector for a year and a half, and we still have every reason to hope that this success will continue. Concerned though we are by this countervailing duty petition, we should be gratified to recognize that with all the lawyers and lobbyists the U.S. industry has been unable to convince Congress or the administration to take action directly against Canadian lumber. Instead, after a huge political effort, the U.S. coalition must turn again to the same quasi judicial procedure that failed the coalition three years ago when Canadian practices were proven acceptable under U.S. law.

While the Government is deeply disturbed by this latest turn of events, we are grateful that at least we will have our day in court. We believe that the facts will speak in our favour and that the benefits of free trade and lumber will continue to be available to both countries.

We on the government side of the House resent the implication that the case is already lost. U.S. trade law is established to ensure that producers and consumers benefit from reliable, fair practices. There is absolutely no evidence that a tariff on Canadian lumber would be good for the economy of the United States. Indeed, the negative impact on the construction, home furnishings and trucking industries, to name but a few, far outweighs the advantages gained by the U.S. economy when lumber producers become more profitable through higher prices.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind in this House as to the aim of this petition. It is to raise the price of lumber. Discussion about Canadian stumpage practices or any other Canadian practices from job creation to industrial incentives are strictly red herrings.