

S. O. 29

lobbyists in Europe on their elected Members that our efforts here are not being fully recognized or appreciated.

The grand chief of the First Nations, Mr. Erasmus, said:

They are basically trying to change the fundamental relationship between animal life in general and human beings. They are basically challenging our use of fur . . . they are challenging the fundamental relationship between man and wildlife, and they are doing it gradually. They are doing it in a way in which they have learned they can win at this game, and they have sensationalized one aspect of the struggle at a time. They are doing it methodically. They have fanatics in the back of them, but in the front of them they have moderates.

The animal rights groups are unrealistic in their goals and the current movements in Europe. If their goals are met it will undoubtedly be extremely harmful to the many Canadians who depend on the fur industry for their livelihood. What the British and European parliamentarians and public must recognize about our fur industry is that it is the responsible harvesting of a renewable resource.

I raise this issue today because I feel it is extremely important at this time to send a strong message to the British and European Parliaments and public. What the elected representatives are being told through the animal rights lobbying groups are distortions and manipulations of fact. As these interest groups did with the seal pup issue, they have singled out Canada and our export industry as their initial target. The European public is being fed sensationalized videos, billboards, and posters. They are hearing documentaries with misinformation and half-truths.

In this time of need, as Canadian parliamentarians, we must act. I say to my colleagues that we must remain steadfast in our support for the fur industry, in our support for trappers across our country, and in our support for our native communities and people for whom the fur trade is an integral part of their lives.

We are tonight trying to ensure that thousands of Canadians will have the opportunity to continue a way of life which is vital to them and their communities. We must ensure that they have the opportunity to continue what they believe is correct.

● (2020)

In conclusion, I wish to draw into focus what this debate tonight is all about. It is not necessarily about an economic industry, an export commodity, but about individual Canadians, their own sense of being, and about a livelihood and way of life.

Let me leave with the House the thoughts of an elder:

I have been a trapper all my life. I had a family, but I lost my wife. I am just by myself now. I am 69 years old. I draw the Old Age Pension and I am still trapping.

I have never been to school. I just live in the bush. All I know is how to sign my name on a cheque. I cannot read one word, but I make a living anyway.

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise tonight to speak on this very urgent and

pressing matter of the proposed order by the British Government and Trade Minister Alan Clark. He is proposing to bring in an order stating that garments may contain a label saying that some furs in the garment may have been caught in a leg-hold trap.

It is important to put this debate into context. We are not debating an anti trapping issue, but what is the precursor of an anti fur issue.

When we consider what happened with the sealing industry, with a campaign that began largely on an emotional argument based on little environmental data, we can see what can happen to an industry and the lives of the people involved in it.

Today we are dealing with a \$600 million a year industry in Canada that is primarily a family oriented industry. Most retail furriers are small business furriers. The people who make the garments are mostly involved in small family businesses. Then there are the trappers and fur ranchers themselves.

The British Trade Minister said that this proposed order to label furs is a minimal response to a strong so-called animal rights lobby. Let me make the distinction between animal rights and animal welfare. I am sure very few people would disagree that we all must be concerned about the welfare of animals and ensure that animals are treated humanely and not subjected to inhumane treatment as part of our ecology and environment.

There is a strong lobby in Britain against animals being killed for any purpose, including medical research. This can occasionally take comic proportions. For example, in Maclean's on March 21, 1988, in an article entitled "Stocking Canada's Wild Fur Industry", the British humour magazine *Punch* asks whether the next step in the battle over animal rights might come when sweaters suddenly appear on store shelves bearing labels that warn: "This sheep was damned cold without this wool".

It is true that this proposed legislation has a very incremental effect on many products. For example, a product may be labelled that it creates a deterioration of the ozone level because of the way it is manufactured. While this incremental effect may be ludicrous on the one hand, it is also very serious.

The legislation in Britain specifically addresses the leg-hold trap. That is a form of trap used for many animals, but primarily for submersible animals like beaver and muskrat, which are caught under the water by the trap. Therefore, many of the objections to this trap are simply not applicable.

However, it is important to consider this issue from the British perspective. When I visited England a couple of weeks ago, it was clear to me that many British legislators understandably considered this from their own historical and cultural perspective, which was the exploitation of furs.

The history of the fur trade in Canada is that people from abroad, primarily Britain, took as many furs as possible and