

Supply

Mr. Rossi: Mr. Speaker, as usual, the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) is putting his own interpretation on what is said. When I said: "That is right", I meant that—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please.

Mr. Rossi: The answer comes from the Hon. Member for Skeena. That is not your answer. You have not got enough guts to give your own answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please.

Mr. St. Germain: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is called for. We are debating an important issue here. The question which was asked of the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount (Mr. Johnston) was a legitimate one. It relates to something about which I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson). As far as I see it, as the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody, the issue here is jobs. That is the question. When the question was put to the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount, it reflected directly on jobs. Does the Hon. Member for Burnaby concur with that?

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody is quite right. Effectively, what we are talking about in terms of the export of raw cedar logs and shake bolts is a question of the direct export of jobs from the Province of British Columbia, particularly from the riding of the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody. These are jobs which in many cases are the jobs of my own constituents and constituents from other parts of the Lower Mainland. That is the issue. That is why I am so disappointed that the representative of the Liberal Party would stand in his place and seriously suggest on behalf of his Party that it supports the export of raw cedar logs and shake bolts from British Columbia. As the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody has indicated, the Liberal Party is saying that it supports the export of jobs from Canada to the United States.

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have rarely seen in this House a Member of Parliament dig himself such a deep and immediate hole as that dug by the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount (Mr. Johnston). I am sorry that he has chosen to absent himself from the House now. Rather than become lengthy on this matter I would like to quote from page 13620 of yesterday's *Hansard*. At that time, the Hon. Member for Mission—Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) said the following:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the U.S. protectionist tariff action against Canada's cedar shake and shingle industry, will the Minister take action to prevent raw materials such as cedar blocks and logs from British Columbia being imported into the United States, effectively transferring the Canadian shake and shingle production and Canadian jobs across the border and, if so, what action will he take?

• (1730)

The Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) responded by saying in part the following:

I can give the Hon. Member the assurance that the Government will not permit the Canadian shake and shingle industry to be exported across the border.

I congratulate the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) for entrapping so well the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount. The Hon. Member should never have risen to his feet to speak in the first place because he does not have a grasp of the subject. That is the bottom line. He does not know what a bolt means, except perhaps to bolt from the Chamber when the Hon. Member for Kootenay West rises to speak and to explain the problem to him. He was shaking in his shoes, and I do not know if he was also scratching because he has shingles. That is the sum total of his knowledge of the subject.

To what has the Hon. Member for Saint-Henri—Westmount agreed? He has agreed willingly and forthrightly to export the shake and shingle industry in total, jobs, equipment, machinery and the works, to the United States. That is what he has proposed, and he has agreed today that that is the policy of his Party. I can see CTV having a lot of fun with this one tonight.

This is a very important motion in that it deals with perhaps the most important economic initiative ever undertaken by this or any other Government in many years. I speak of the motion itself and its intent. It is unfortunate that members of the Opposition should seek to take political advantage of the hardship of thousands of Canadians, the bulk of them located in British Columbia. They have presented a motion which capitalizes upon the anger of every Member of the House to present a suggestion which can only be called irresponsible.

This motion holds the bilateral negotiation hostage to a reversal of the shingles decision. In doing so, the Opposition ignores the fact that this action is a symptom of a disease that is rampant in the United States today, and that is protectionism, and that the cure for protectionism lies in a new trading agreement. The opposition motion suggests that the symptom hurts so we should refuse to try the cure.

This trade action is exactly the sort of problem that has plagued Canadian industries for many years. Whether it was Canadian lumber, steel, potatoes, berry products or fish industries, there has been a steady parade of industry spokesmen going to Washington to plead their case, the Canadian case. It has been one of the greatest job-creation programs in recent history.

Many Washington lobbyists and lawyers have kept the wolf from the door on the basis of income they have secured from Canadian clients, and one of their best clients has been the Government of Canada. I wonder how many Washington lawyers are putting their children through school so that they too can become lawyers and live off the fat of the Canadian land.