

Supply

I also would like to know why he is being so negative about our negotiations with the United States, when we have access to a market of 240 million people.

Mr. Speaker, since the auto pact has been profitable for this country, the same approach can work today. I would ask the Liberals to be a little fairer in their comments and to stop their nit-picking.

[English]

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has raised three or four different questions. Near the end of his remarks he asked why there is so much negativism today. Let me say that there is much to be negative about. I would suggest that ringing the bells when the house is on fire is not a negative action but a very positive one.

The Hon. Member disappoints me. Perhaps as he spends more time here he will adopt a different attitude. To stand in the Parliament of Canada—not the Legislature of Quebec, Newfoundland or Alberta—and ask: “Why are you as a Member of Parliament from Newfoundland concerned about western Canada?” begs another question to be asked. That is to say: “What, sir, are you doing here if you would even put such a question?” The Hon. Member is a Member of the Canadian Parliament. If he does not feel as at home in this Parliament in the Province of Ontario as he would in the Province of Quebec, and if he does not feel as welcome in my great riding of Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe as he might in Skeena or in Vancouver, then he had better go back and ask himself why he decided to seek a job as a Member of Parliament of Canada.

Why am I concerned? Because I am a Canadian who comes from Newfoundland. But my fellow Canadians live in British Columbia, and I have been there. I have been to Prince George, I have been to Prince Rupert and to Vancouver. I have heard the stories of the people who live there. I talked to a very good friend of mine yesterday who lives in Smithers. This is a person with whom I grew up, who used to live in Newfoundland and who is now a British Columbian. He gives his loyalty to and takes his lifeblood from that province. He is concerned. That is why I am here raising questions. I do not see this as some type of parochial House in which resides a whole series of feudal kingdoms. We are all Canadians in this place, are we not?

The Member asks why we did not settle the problem in 1983. Again the Hon. Member shows that he needs to spend a few more days in this place. We won the case in 1983. It was settled. For some reason during the course of the tenure of this Government the Americans have decided that we should be tried twice, an unprecedented action. If the Hon. Member did his homework he would know that.

The Hon. Members asks why I have not talked about the Prime Minister's visit to Japan. Unfortunately, the former Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion was having some great difficulties during the course of the Prime Minister's visit to Japan. I doubt if anyone knows that he was there. We were dealing instead with the large question of conflict of interest. As much as I, and in particular the Prime Minister, would have preferred to talk about his visit to Japan, unfortunately, one of the Minister's of the Government provided a much more interesting topic to talk about during that period of time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I hope the Hon. Member will entertain one more question from the Hon. Member for Carleton—Charlotte (Mr. McCain).

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, my question for the Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) is this. How does it happen that this Government finds itself in a position in which there is no compensation available to Canada for either legislation or decisions concerning the quasi judicial process of the United States when it has imposed a surcharge on Canadian products going into that country? How does that happen? Is the Hon. Member prepared to answer that question in the seconds that are left in this morning's debate?

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Carleton—Charlotte (Mr. McCain), as is his practice, always comes to the nub of the question. He asks a very intelligent and worthwhile question. The Hon. Member asks how it is that there is no compensation for an unfair tariff. That is really the premise of his question; if it was a fair tariff, if it was responsible, then we might not have a complaint. However, it is an unfair, unwarranted and unjustified tariff. How is it that there is no compensation? I say to the Hon. Member that if this administration had made clear to the Americans that they cannot always expect the benefit of the doubt when they take these types of regressive measures, punishing—

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The question is not being addressed in the sense in which it was asked. We are operating within the parameters—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but that is debate.

Before I leave the Chair at one o'clock I would like to say that the time allotted for questions and comments has now terminated. I will recognize the next speaker, the Hon. Member for Timmins—Chapleau (Mr. Gervais), when debate resumes this afternoon.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.