

trade issues and other irritants. These would provide proper safeguards for Canada.

There are only a few key issues which face Canada. One is Canada-U.S. relations and another is government intrusion into the private and public economies. The third would be the nationalism issue between Quebec and Canada. There are other issues, but those are the basic issues with which we will always deal in Canada. The Government has fumbled the ball on this particular issue.

● (1350)

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one reference. I wish the Government would read the brief by Charles Widman on behalf of the softwood lumber manufacturers. I think they got a raw deal in the agreement the Government made with the United States. They have now been lumped in. They do not just export, they do some manufacturing. They were not properly consulted. That oversight is going to cost a number of jobs in British Columbia. I say to the Government and to the Minister, for heaven's sakes, look at the deal again in terms of making some adjustments for this group because I think they have a particularly good case. They say the duty was designed primarily to impose a tariff on the primary producers of lumber and that in fact the secondary remanufacturers are being adversely affected. I think that is an unjust part of the deal.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Grondin (Saint-Maurice):** Mr. Speaker, whatever the Hon. Member for Champlain (Mr. Champagne) may have said to the contrary, we certainly have no intention of playing petty politics with this Bill. We are not that conservative! In any case, I tend to take all political rhetoric with a grain of salt, and as for the applause my hon. friend garnered during his speech, it came from the only people who think they have anything to applaud about in the House today.

We look beyond what this Bill provides for here and now, in an attempt to foresee the short-, medium- and long-term consequences, something this Government is not doing at all. If the Government would try to look at the short-, medium- and long-term instead of producing Bills to cover immediate needs only, the polls would start looking up and it would still have some credibility left with the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to speak to this matter today, considering the impact of the Softwood Lumber Products Export Charge Act on the Province of Quebec and across Canada.

Actually, nothing would surprise me from a Government that is bending over backwards to let our American neighbours decide what is good for Canada. What does surprise me is that hardly any Conservative Members from Quebec, aside from a few who rose in the House, including my hon. friend from Champlain a few minutes ago, have been in the House to speak to this Bill. The point was brought up by several

### *Softwood Lumber Products*

Members during the previous debate, and I noticed it myself in the course of the proceedings on this Bill.

Of course I realize Conservative Members from Quebec would be somewhat reluctant to speak to this question since the Bill has the unfortunate effect of taxing Quebec producers more than producers in some other provinces.

A Conservative Member from Quebec would have a hard time convincing his constituents that he was right to approve a Bill that applied a double standard to Canadian industries, depending on the province, since the F.O.B. value of the product varies from region to region and from province to province.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that a number of Canadian industries, including some in Quebec and particularly those which get their lumber supply from the United States, will be very hard hit by this tax ordered by the Americans.

I simply cannot understand why the Government will not listen to the representations and recommendations of lumber producers' associations which point out to the Government that this tax will eventually lead to a 10 to 20 per cent decline in the current Canadian production, worth roughly \$600 million in 1987, and 15,000 to 17,000 fewer jobs. These cut-backs include about 6,000 jobs in cutting operations and 11,000 jobs in related and support industries.

A member of the Canadian Lumbermen's Association goes even further by stating that Canadian softwood lumber production might decrease by as much as 25 per cent in 1987. Mr. Speaker, how can anyone talk about stability in this industry when provisions of this Bill on the export charge, Clauses 9 and 26(3), indicate that the agreement may be cancelled within 30 days? How can an agreement which is subject to cancellation within 30 days contribute to create or maintain a climate of stability in this industry?

Mr. Speaker, this agreement may very well lead to similar demands from some of our trade partners who would want Canada to meet their conditions and would take advantage of the weakness of our representatives and of our Government to say that, since they are proud to be major economic and trade powers, we should get down on our knees before them and implement countervailing measures applicable to various other products which we export on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, signing an agreement with one of our trade partners can only be an incentive for other countries with which we maintain trade relations. Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me how our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and our Minister for International Trade (Miss Carney) can walk out of the House after Oral Question Period or on any other occasion with their heads held high, and as soon as they are outside the House and meet their American friends, they crawl and start bartering away our country and our sovereignty while penalizing Canadian industry.