

### Supply

Canada must double its spending on reforestation to \$650 million annually. When is the money coming? When is it going to happen? What we have now is a policy of restraint with controlled exploitation, nothing more, nothing less.

Of the money which the Province is spending, two-thirds to three-quarters of it is being spent on roads. Access roads to do what? To cut more trees. Some 25 per cent of fires are caused by lightning and these fires cause 90 per cent of the damage in forestry. Where are the road patterns? Where are the water bombers which we need to control the damage being caused by fires? They do not exist now, Mr. Speaker, and they are not going to exist in the next ten years unless we in common, without looking at the politics of it, insist we have these things.

Right now in northern Ontario we have serious shortfalls of timber, especially in the Hearst area, and nothing is being done about it. The UN reports indicate that by the year 2000 there will only be half of the forests we now have on this planet. The Science Council of Canada recently put out a report to which the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap referred, but how many people read it? Or if they read it, did they think about it for more than half an hour, a day or even a week? Everyone is calling for a federal Ministry of Forestry. The industry is calling for a federal Ministry as well as the northern Ontario caucus and the Province. Yet we do not have a federal Ministry of Forestry. It is said that we look on the forests as something to exploit. It is said that the high quality, old growth forest has gone. It is said that much of which is remaining is overmature and defective.

The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap referred to the hardwood which they have to import for the furniture industry in Quebec. A walnut tree now costs from \$7,000 to \$9,000 to bring in because most of our good hardwood has gone. If we continue at this rate, most of our black spruce, our pine and our tamaracks will be gone with it.

There has been reference to the former assistant deputy minister of forestry. I thought he was a fine man who went as far as he could within his scope, basically as a senior civil servant. The policy has to come from here and from the Provinces, not from the assistant deputy minister or the deputy minister. The ADM said that each year 200,000 to 400,000 hectares of valuable forest are being added to this shameful waste, and he was right. The Science Council of Canada said that it wants a jump in reforestation and stand treatment from \$300 million to \$650 million. It sounds like a lot of money, but it is not when compared to what is at risk. It wants a jump from \$250 million to \$500 million for protection costs, which again is not a lot of money when you look at the risk. As a matter of fact, there is a report which says we spent \$89 million in other countries on their forest programs. We have more foresters per capita working out of Canada than any other country in the world. It is said that we do a better job abroad than we do right here in our own country. Our job is to grow trees, not to export civil servants.

The Science Council of Canada said that we could generate another 100,000 jobs if we brought in a reasonable program of reforestation. I do not know about other Hon. Members, but I

am a little tired of these programs we are putting out which go nowhere, which do not give the people any pride in what they are doing and do not give us a profit in return. What can be better than to have a program which hires 100,000, 200,000 or even 300,000 Canadians to go out and do something which involves a little bit of pride? They do not have just to plant trees; there is more to reforestation than that. It is an industry in itself. They would have the pride of working and we would be providing for the future.

There is a phrase I use often because I like it so much. I heard it in Michigan at a conference of Amish farmers. The phrase was:

We did not inherit this land from our forefathers, we borrowed it from our children.

We have to get that fact through our thick heads.

There are now 300 communities in Canada which could fail partially or totally if the forest industry in those areas fails. One of those communities happens to be mine. I almost laughed aloud when I heard the comment one of the Hon. Members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition put to the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, that perhaps it was the labourers who were holding back the program. That is about the silliest thing I ever heard. I have never heard of a labourer in the pulp and paper or hardwood industries say: "I am against your putting some money in reforestation or regeneration".

The Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company in my riding employs about 400 or 500 men. It is basically your average company. There are no evil men at Abitibi. However, the thinking of that company is exactly the thinking which brought the forest industry down in Canada. In 1972, when I was mayor, the company threatened to close. It is threatening to close this year, 1983. I met with the president and he said to me: "When I started with this company 30 years ago we used to build one mile of road and harvest that one mile for three years. In 1982 we had to put in three miles of road for one year of harvest." Who does he think cut the trees? The beavers? It was Abitibi which cut those trees and did not reforest that area. Mr. Les Reed said—and he is right because it is being done in Scandinavian countries—that all you need is 100 kilometres around the plant; if you reforest that area properly, you can go on ad infinitum. But that has not been done. Certainly not in Canada. The historical summation by the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) of the Canadian Forestry Service was excellent. We have to be reminded that at one time we did have a Minister of Forestry. As Canadians we always tend to support the status quo. In this case we do not even support the status quo. The last Minister was the Hon. Maurice Sauvé in 1966. This institution goes back from 1899 to 1930. It handles four western Provinces and in some of them it did not do that great a job. Until the provincial Government of Saskatchewan took over the forestry business we had run havoc in that Province. The Canadian Forestry Service has brought much of it back under its care. From 1930 to 1983 it was concerned with basic research. Now it is "the lead agency for forestry" in the federal Government. That