

They were paid for and my friend's question again is who paid for them? The Canadian taxpayer paid for them.

**Mr. Brewin:** How do you like the \$20 million on competitive as Canada promotion? Is that a good one?

**Mr. Simmons:** I have friends in all parties who write speeches for me even as I talk, like my friend from Victoria in the wrong party but with a good idea, and I congratulate him. It gives me another marvellous example of how this government knows how not to spend money.

I digress and I do not want to try the patience of my good friend, the Speaker, too much. I was making the point that the people of my province, like the people of every other province, are being short changed very badly in terms of their access to health care. I made that point. I wanted to go on and give the other example of their access to post-secondary education.

I am sure you were all thrilled last week when you heard that budget. If ever there was a candy-coated budget, it was last week's. You can candy coat different kinds of things. People have been known to candy coat arsenic. You can candy coat anything you want. That does not change the flavour or the effect of what is under the candy. It was a candy-coated budget and for students at Canadian universities, once they got past the candy part, here is what they found.

The government had tampered further with post-secondary education. The government heretofore under the Canada Student Loan Program had allowed a six month period of grace, six months after the student finishes university, during which there is an interest holiday. There is no interest charged on the loan. They have to pay the loan, but they did not have to pay interest on that loan in respect to the first six months after the student finished university.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Will the hon. member allow the Speaker to make a ruling and then carry on with his speech? The hon. Speaker has a ruling to make for the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley and then I will get back to the hon. member.

**Mr. Speaker:** I say, first of all, to the hon. member for Burin—St. George's that I appreciate very much his

courtesy and the courtesy extended to me by the other members of the House.

To the hon. member, I will hear the argument.

\* \* \*

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52

### SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your brief time today to consider what I think is an important issue and to rise under Standing Order 52. It relates to the matters raised in the House today by members from all sides of the House. It relates to the decision on Friday that precipitated a decision from the commerce department in the United States regarding the very important debate over softwood lumber and our exports to the United States.

• (1610)

We have had a number of negative decisions on trade policy from Washington, D.C. They are certainly impairing our country's ability to trade with the United States. This decision in particular on softwood lumber tariff will have an impact on well over 300 forest communities throughout Canada.

It is a very important issue. It falls under the provisions of Standing Order 52 because of its importance. The dollar value alone relates to this issue, given the vast amount of lumber exports into the United States and the number of communities across Canada that are affected by this.

It is an important debate that this House must have, and I would certainly be prepared to assist in any arrangements that might allow for that debate so that all Canadians can know what the members of this House feel about this most important issue.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** First of all I thank the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley for giving me notice in advance.

I should say that a number of members raised the matter today and there was a considerable exchange at Question Period on this very important matter.