

### Supply

tourism potential. They were not properly logged. Mr. Speaker, the association concludes by saying:

The Association believes alternatives to large-scale projects exist—such as co-generation of power from industrial processes and waste products. Political will is required to encourage the development of these resources.

The Association's brief was endorsed by a coalition of resource industries, user groups including the B.C. Federation of Agriculture, B.C. Forest Foundation, B.C. Wildlife Federation, the Fisheries Association of B.C., the B.C. Institute of Agrologists, the Canadian Institute of Forestry, Greenpeace and the Sierra Club.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty clear that when we are talking about forestry matters it goes far beyond what one might think. The companies in this country in many cases have gone in and ripped off the resource. They have gone in and cut it, made the biggest boom profit that they can and then they have taken off with the profits and left a heritage, as is pointed out by the Professional Foresters Association, of close to half the land that is logged being of no value to future generations in terms of logging or wildlife values or fishery values and so on.

The Minister of the Environment is saying no to the proposal for a new Ministry. This famous Royal commission with the \$800 a day man travelling around does not agree obviously with the Liberal Cabinet. We read this:

#### FOREST PRIORITY HINTED—MACDONALD PREDICTION AT HEARINGS

Royal commission chairman Donald Macdonald dropped his first hint Thursday about what he will recommend to the federal Government—higher priority for the forest industry.

The article goes on to say that it is about time the federal Government did something about it.

Some of the speakers today touched on the fact that provincial Governments are at least partly responsible for the devastation that we see now in the forest sector. In British Columbia we now recognize that there is what is called a 20 year falldown effect. There simply are not enough trees to continue at today's level of harvest and mill production. We cannot continue to cut at today's rate 20 years from now. Where are the logs going? What are the Tories' good friends in Victoria, Bill Bennett and the Socreds, doing with trees during this downturn in the marketability of pulp and of sawn wood? Mr. Speaker, any day you can take almost any newspaper in British Columbia and see lists of logs for sale, application no. 1914, application for hemlock spruce pulp, Metropolitan Trading, E.R. Probyn Limited, Crown Zellerbach, Canadian Overseas Log, and so on. The Socred proposal is simply to go in and cut the logs and send them overseas, let them be milled somewhere else and let the jobs occur in another country. They consider that to be good business. Let us see what the effect of those kinds of log exports are. I quote from a report run just a little while ago. It reads:

Log exports alone are going to cause a shortfall of 30,000 jobs—

Those are permanent jobs, Mr. Speaker:

—by the year 2000.

The IWA in British Columbia was protesting the export of those logs. Those are the same workers who would be affected by slowing down the cutting of trees for that kind of processing.

Mr. Speaker, *Harrowsmith* recently ran an editorial which I think is worth reflecting on for a moment in the House in terms of whether or not this House is actually going to do something, get a senior Ministry, get a First Ministers' conference together and actually get on with the job of getting the forest sector back on its feet.

Reflecting on the report of the Science Council of Canada, which apparently the Liberals have no intention of pursuing, they say the following:

One-eighth of Canada's productive forest area has deteriorated to the point where huge tracts lie devastated, unable to regenerate a merchantable crop within the next 60 to 80 years. Each year, some 200,000 to 400,000 hectares of valuable forest are being added to this shameful waste.

Those are lands, Mr. Speaker, that are now lying totally idle in terms of the capacity for them to be exploited, whether for pulp marketability or for saw logs:

Annually, from coast to coast, some 350 million tree seedlings are planted in Canada. By contrast, Sweden, which is roughly the size of Alberta, plants 400 million seedlings. Some 300 Canadian communities are primarily dependent on logging and timber processing for their livelihood . . . Moreover, as each job in the woods and mills is associated with one additional job locally and a second elsewhere in the national economy, a decline in the forest industries will have a pervasive effect on the economy as a whole—

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we are seeing now. The Minister of Employment and Immigration sent me a letter saying I should not worry about getting additional funding from the federal Government because unemployment in the forest sector in Skeena and the northwest of British Columbia is now only 50 per cent of peak employment levels. Well, la-di-da! I simply cannot sympathize with a Government that takes that kind of approach, not only to the individuals affected but to an industry of such great consequence to the country. Canada's forests generate over \$1 billion in tax revenues for the federal Government, more than the earnings from fishing, mining, fuels and agriculture combined. What is the Government spending? I think this is what Canadians and workers in the industry need to know. Those in the media need to know this so they can start writing some appropriately sharply pointed editorials about the lackadaisical attitude of the present Government.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from a speech given by Les Reed who was the Assistant Deputy Minister and who brought a ray of hope and sunlight into the Canadian Forest Service of this country. Unfortunately he has now resigned, one can only assume because of the lack of action on the Government side. He said the following:

Provincial, federal, and industry spending for silviculture in 1979 was estimated to be about \$178 million. Estimated public revenue generated by the forest industry for 1979 was over \$3 billion. Unfortunately, only 5 cents of each dollar of revenue generated to governments is put back through forest renewal.