

Customs Tariff

connection, will enter the country duty free. If the same items come in from any other country, however, a duty will be imposed on them.

Is any Hon. Member opposite who is interested in goods designed to assist the people who are disabled to move around, willing to impose an extra duty on these goods? If not, then I wonder if Hon. Members opposite have read Bill C-90. And if they have, do they understand it? If they do understand it then they are agreeing to impose a duty which will make these items, designed to assist the disabled, more expensive. I have a hard time understanding why Hon. Members opposite would be interested in imposing such a duty.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, I think we are making a fundamental error here. There is an attitude amongst Members of the Government and, I suspect, amongst Members of the Official Opposition, which says that if we can move toward freer trade, if we can reduce tariff walls, then that will obviously be in our best interests. I am sure there is no Member of the House who does not recognize that while many other nations voice that same rhetoric, they are in fact introducing measures to keep foreign products out; they are introducing protectionist measures, not in the form of tariffs.

I think Japan prides itself on doing that. The Japanese Government, unlike the Government of Canada and most of our provincial Governments, has made it a policy to encourage its people to support Japanese industries whenever and wherever possible. There is a strong "buy Japanese" ethic in that country, and the Japanese people have rallied to the call. Whenever possible they buy from the Japanese supplier rather than from the foreign supplier. That is a subtle way of imposing a tariff without calling it a tariff or, by introducing a number of certification and testing measures, to retard the entry of foreign commodities and services into that marketplace.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest that as we discuss the matter of imposing or reducing or even maintaining existing tariff levels, we should do so in the context of a comprehensive, over-all economic strategy. We should be able to see what we are attempting to nurture and encourage and what we are attempting to move away from. We should identify which industries should receive our support in their formative years and which should not.

Until we articulate that in a clear way, the whole discussion of tariff and tariff walls is a rather academic one and, at best, ad hoc.

I know the sheep producers in my constituency would be very interested to see that we are taking a small step in order to reduce the imports of mutton and lamb from countries like New Zealand.

Mr. Lewis: Your argument is rather woolly!

Mr. Riis: Well, some people might say that my arguments are woolly, but I think that item serves as an example of the

kind of negotiations and discussions that must take place with the private sector and the public sector in order to ensure that we have identified the industries we propose to support. We should take appropriate measures to protect those industries, particularly during their formative years.

Mr. Nielsen: Question.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

An Hon. Member: Filibuster!

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, in order to give the Minister an opportunity to respond this evening, I should like to suggest that it is six o'clock. We would be more than prepared to give the Minister unanimous consent to comment on some of the aspects of this matter raised in the House and some of the aspects that the Tories—

• (1800)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. Let us deal with them one at a time. The Hon. Member cannot have two points of order at the same time which happen to be contradictory. Shall I call it six o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Shall I put the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Skelly: Call it six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I have an Hon. Member who wants to call it six o'clock. In order to go around that, I need only recognize for half a moment any Hon. Member who will stand on his feet.

Mr. Nielsen: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I need an Hon. Member to stand on his feet for one moment.

Mr. Nielsen: The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) has already spoken.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): He has spoken. The Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling).

Mr. Nielsen: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is the House ready for the question, or shall I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member did not rise. Put the question, put the question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): That is what I am about to do. The question is as follows—is the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) seeking the floor on a point or order?

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, since the hour is now six o'clock, I would like to call it six o'clock.

Mr. Nielsen: Filibuster.