

Supply

in conclusion about the difference between the statesman's approach and the politician's approach. I think you too, Mr. Speaker, would probably agree that forestry of all matters requires the statesman's approach, if only because it takes anywhere from 40 to 80 years for a tree to mature and be a resource that we can use in this country. We must look beyond the next election in forestry. That is one of the problems that has beset all Parties.

I am delighted that, despite the misgivings that I might have had about this particular resolution insofar as it involves the expenditure of public funds to set up a new Ministry, it has been accepted for debate so that we may continue today what we started yesterday.

● (1540)

In order to further that notion about how long it takes for the trees to mature and be of use to our society, I would like to quote a comment made by one who has devoted his working life to forestry. He is Mr. Les Reed, who was, until very recently, as the Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of Environment in the federal Government dealing with forestry. He made a notable contribution at that time and one of the comments he made was, "Land is not something we inherit from our parents but something we borrow from our children". This is just as true of the forests. We do not inherit forests from our parents but they are something we borrow from our children. We must borrow them very carefully and we must make sure that they are restored so that our children will be able to harvest the forest.

Once again, I think of those young people who are sitting in the Chamber as pages. It is their forests that we are consuming, and if we want to borrow them we must replace them. They are not our forests, they are their forests and we must replace them in such a way and with such scientific precision that they will know, when their turn comes, how to use them in that way as well and pass those forests on to the next generation. This is one of the most important messages that we must draw from this particular debate of today and yesterday.

If we think we are being inventive by deciding to bring this matter up today, I would just like to remind the House and those who will read the *Debates*, that as long ago as 1938 the same message was laid out before us by economists and economic historians of Canada in a book on the relations between Canada and the United States. It is a series by the Ryerson Press. The principal author as A. R. M. Lower, and the other contributors were Prof. Carrothers of the University of British Columbia and Prof. Saunders. While I am sure this was written earlier than 35 years ago, A. R. M. Lower had this to say at page 201:

Scientific reforestation may play a part, for much of old Ontario has soil fitted best for tree growth and for the white pine especially.

Speaking of white pine, I recall in the reading I was doing in preparation for this debate, although I cannot locate it at the moment, that in the days when the woods were being wantonly destroyed in Ontario—cleared for agricultural purposes but thoughtlessly destroyed—a white pine stood 250 feet high not

far from where we are standing. The Peace Tower is just over 300 feet high. Have you seen a white pine standing 250 feet high?

Mr. Evans: Neither have you.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): No, I have not.

Mr. Evans: Because they do not grow that high.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): They used to and they ought to. That is the purpose of this debate. It is to make sure that that age can return and that we shall again see trees of that magnitude and of that beauty.

I do not know whether the Hon. Member remembers that there was a storm out in British Columbia approximately a week ago which blew down some trees in Cathedral Grove on the road from Nanaimo to Port Alberni. Since members of the road crew were on strike, the people went out and cleared the road. The trees that fell across the road—and I hope they were not my favourite trees—came from a grove on the south side of that road and were standing there over 750 years ago. Those trees were standing 20 feet tall when the Magna Carta was being signed. That shows the durability of those magnificent trees.

I believe that one cannot be deeply and irrevocably tied to the soil and know what Canada is until one has seen the trees in Cathedral Grove, looked up and seen them standing hundreds of feet in the air. They have been standing there for over 700 years and it is an awesome sight.

That is what we must preserve. One of the ways of preserving it, I believe, is to follow the recommendation that is in this resolution and return to that age when there indeed was a Ministry of Forestry in the Canadian Government. The record of that Ministry was laid before us this morning by the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). That Ministry was instituted by the administration of the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker and was then dismantled and redistributed after a period of about seven years by the Liberals. At the insistence of the Government of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), at least a special forestry branch of the Department of Environment was established and Les Reed, whom I mentioned earlier, was brought in to head that particular branch.

Today we are dealing with a renewable resource. I think we should recall the difference between renewable and non-renewable resources. I would like to remind the House of the manner in which the Alberta Government is dealing with a non-renewable resource. It has established, for posterity, for those like these young pages and their children who come after us, a fund which it calls the Heritage Fund. It was established out of the revenue of a non-renewable resource. While we are talking today about a renewable resource, we can establish a heritage fund as well. This is possible if we behave as the Hon. Member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Irwin) has suggested, like statesmen, and remember that that renewable resource has to be planted, tended and then harvested. It will then be harvest-