

developed there. It grows much quicker and will provide the necessary raw product for our paper mills. There are currently about 3,000 acres, with a total of 5,000 well established acres. These plantations are increasing by 1,100 per year. There are 600 acres cared for by the Ministry and 500 acres privately run.

The emphasis of this program is on technology transfer. The companies involved, and I give them full credit, include Domtar and Granville Christian College as it purchases fuel for each. Other projects are by Ontario Paper, Malette Waterford and the Eddy Match Company. The Government is financing with a fifty-fifty split between the two levels of Government, and the 1980-84 term has provided \$500,000. In addition, the National Research Council is involved.

It is interesting to note that it takes 60 years for a hardwood tree to reach maturity. Pulpwood trees require about 40 years. The hybrid poplar can be harvested within seven years. It will have a diameter of about seven inches. That is amazing.

As I pointed out earlier, we are in tough competition with Georgia, where vegetation and growth is much superior. Our friends in Sweden spend \$1 billion a year on silviculture, protecting their forests, reforestation and protection against acid rain. We in this country spend probably no more than 25 per cent of that amount.

● (1630)

As a member of the Subcommittee on Acid Rain, Mr. Speaker, I am vitally interested in the subject and am interested in the fact that acid rain is doing considerable harm to our forests, not only to the seedlings but also to the mature trees. People have pointed out to me that during certain periods of time after a severe rain, one can actually see what has happened to the leaves of the trees from acid rain.

I know there are other Members who are interested in the subject of acid rain and I know how important this subject is. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to this, the most important industry in the entire Dominion of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments, answers? Debate.

Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, once again I welcome the opportunity to say a few words about Canada's resource sector and what the Government has been doing to encourage and develop this sector over the past few years, particularly since the Government obtained its latest mandate in February, 1980. I am very proud to be a supporter of the Government at a time when economic fortunes have not been as promising as we would have liked.

The Government has been able to stabilize and preserve the welfare program at a time when other voices have been saying that it ought to cut back. The Government has been able to hold its own in terms of the balance of trade and in terms of exports to other countries. However, it is in the achievements of the Government in the resource sector over the past four years in particular that supporters of the Government can take

Supply

greatest pride. I say that having in mind particularly what the Government has done in the energy sector.

The Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle), when wording his resolution, must have had in mind the speech made by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) which was delivered in Calgary a few days ago. I am sure Hon. Members of the Opposition will remember that speech. They want very much to forget it but it is on the record. It will be difficult for them to forget that speech. We on this side will not let them forget that speech for a couple of reasons. The first reason we will not let them forget that speech is that it is the closest the gentleman from Central Nova has come to putting himself on the record in so far as any policy position is concerned. We will remember it for that reason. However, Mr. Speaker, it is a landmark speech for another reason. What the Leader of the Opposition put on the record one day, he tried to disown the following day and the day after that. He will have difficulty disowning that particular speech, but that is another subject, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying that the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River must have had that particular speech in mind when he worded his resolution because, in some respects, it seems to me that the Hon. Member cribbed some of the wording and perhaps some of the ideas from the very first speech made by the Leader of the Opposition on the subject of energy policy. At that time, the Leader of the Opposition suggested that he would change some of the energy measures and would abolish others, but in the end he really did not tell us what energy policy he would follow as the Leader of the Government. A few days after that speech, no one is really sure what it is that the Leader of the Opposition wants to change. I am anxious to know and I believe all Canadians are anxious to know what he wants to change. It is a pity that we may never know.

In the meantime, Hon. Members of the Opposition continue to ramble on condemning policies without ever telling the Government what they would put in place of those policies. For example, the Leader of the Official Opposition accused the Government of over-taxing the oil industry. The question to be asked is, would a Tory Government tax the industry less? Are Tory Members telling us that they would tax it less? The oil industry now receives 50 per cent of energy revenues; that is right, 50 per cent of revenues as compared, for example, to the 46 per cent it received just five years ago in 1978. The current share of 50 per cent is much higher, for example, than it was three or four years ago. What was the share in 1979 when the Tories were in power? It was 41 per cent; that is right, 41 per cent under the Tory régime. The industry now receives an additional 9 per cent, totalling 50 per cent of revenues in 1983. In terms of revenue shares, Mr. Speaker, the Government feels that the industry is being treated fairly.

In terms of dollars, the industry revenue position has increased dramatically from \$4.5 billion under the Tory Government in 1979 to \$11.7 billion today. Industry revenues are now two and a half times what they were when the Tories were in power four years ago. Tory Members who were in power