

wealth creation. The forests and their management can utilize our best efforts in the fields of technology.

Time is a major factor in forest management in our country. We take 40 to 100 hundred years to produce a commercially harvestable tree. In the growing period of a forest, there can be as many as 20 elected governments, all with varying priorities and demands from the public. Forest management suffers from instability in government priorities and this has been the case in Canada to date. We need a long-term commitment to management with fixed goals that aim to maintain productivity of the forest land base. We cannot continue to shift our priorities in the forestry arena.

I believe that really hits the nail on the head. Governments are always promising to do things, yet in the lifespan of a forest, as the foresters point out, there may be 20 or more Governments, all with different priorities as to what they want to do. Some want to spray. Some want to cut. Some do not want to replant. Some do not want to put any money back into forestry, and some do. It is one of the largest problems we have to face in this country. As I said before, this is only the second time in the longest sitting Parliament in the history of this country that the issue of forestry has been debated. One of the recommendations of the professional foresters is worth quoting: It reads:

The federal government estimates that the benefits of improved management would create 100,000 new jobs, increase product sales by \$22 billion and increase exports by \$12 billion, doubling the present values, have significant indirect benefits in supply and service industries, and create additional tax revenues of \$3 billion.

One cannot help but wonder why, Mr. Speaker, for such a small investment with such large potential benefits to be accrued, not only to workers but to the economy generally, the Government continues to sit on its hands.

The report goes on, and I believe here is where we really see the results of forest policies for British Columbia and Canada generally:

European foresters have estimated that Canada could produce three to four times more wood per hectare through better practices. The Scandinavian countries (Norway, Sweden and Finland) are capable of cutting a volume of timber equal to all that is harvested in Canada. The production is from an area of one-third to one-quarter of Canada's productive forest land.

It is astonishing, Mr. Speaker, how backward our policies are in this country. They recommend the following:

The present status of the Canadian Forestry Service must be elevated to a departmental level with its own Minister to reflect the actual importance of forests to the nation.

I quote that for the record, and for the Minister who thought there were no facts. I believe Hon. Members of this House need to know where the priorities of this Government lie in terms of forestry.

Just a few days ago I received a letter from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) extolling the virtues of CIDA and what he is doing internationally. Many of the projects which I am going to touch on today are ones which I support and endorse. However, I believe Canadians from coast to coast must be alerted to what the present Government is doing—and what its Tory colleagues did while they were in government—with forestry projects internationally. From 1976 to 1983, Mr. Speaker, the federal Government has spent \$430,165,000 on 102 international forestry projects. Before I comment on some of the specifics of that, Mr.

### Supply

Speaker, it is worth quoting from *The Globe and Mail* of March 24 of this year. The headline reads "Forest spending seen rising to \$650 million in five years". It was the big announcement of the then Minister responsible for Forestry, now Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts), who said the following:

"The federal Government is moving into increased direct support of forest renewal,"—

"We have approval in principle to spend a minimum of \$130-million a year by 1987," compared with \$50 million in 1982, he said.

This Government, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, spent this year \$18 million in Guyana for forest management and planning. Canada is spending in one country, Guyana, half of what it is spending in the whole of our country for our largest industry. In Bangladesh, for rehabilitation and upgrading of a mill, it spent \$8 million; \$35 million in India for a social forestry project; \$25 million in Honduras, with a militarily inclined government, for "development of a new district in the Corocito region, including forest industry". The Government has spent in Honduras this year half of what it spent in all of Canada for silviculture, and so on. In Brazil, for post-graduate training in Canada to the Ph.D. level, it spent \$800,000. We offer better programs in forestry training to Brazilians than we do to Canadians, whether they be from Vancouver or Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or from Fredericton, New Brunswick. There was \$3.5 million spent in Peru for the establishment of a post-graduate school in forestry sciences, and a further \$26 million spent in Peru for a loan for logging and sawmilling equipment. It goes on, Mr. Speaker, page after page. In most cases, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, these are very worthwhile projects, but what kind of government spends more money every single year on forestry outside of Canada than inside its own country for its single largest industry? I will leave it to Canadians to determine what kind of government that is. However, I think we can agree that it is a government which is not particularly bright or future-oriented.

The business section of the Vancouver *Sun* last week ran a headline which reads, "Foresters condemn hydro projects". I raised this today in the House with the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia). I pointed out, again as the B.C. Professional Association of Foresters have noted, that 20,000 permanent forestry jobs have been lost or are about to be lost in British Columbia as a result of flooding for B.C. Hydro projects. They go on to point out that some 834,000 hectares of land are flooded, are reserved for flooding, or for power lines and so on.

• (1650)

Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth noting that the last speaker was from New Brunswick. Maritimers know that Prince Edward Island covers only 565,000 square kilometers. We have a situation in British Columbia where we are losing our very best forest land. We are damaging our salmon and fisheries resources. We are damaging our tourism because all the dams have draw-down areas so at certain times of the year the banks of these man-made lakes are muddy and there is no