

Natural Resources—Development

place in Canada, and we hope they will. Yet we find that day after day we are short of technicians, engineers, scientists, economists and all kinds of trained personnel. Why? Because the federal government apparently has decided that the field of education is one which will have to be by-passed.

All these things come to my mind. I simply want to say, speaking for myself at least, that unless the amendment is related to the willingness of parliament or the government to take independent action altogether apart from what may take place in the field of private enterprise, then the adoption of the amendment will mean that we will be adopting a conglomeration of good intentions. It will do no harm, but it will do no earthly good. I hope that members on both sides of the house will look at the amendment, adopt it, and then provide the public machinery which is available to us to achieve the objectives of the amendment and thereby put some flesh on its bones.

Mr. F. G. J. Hahn (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, during the course of my remarks it is my intention to move an amendment to the amendment to this effect:

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "which" in the third line the following words:

"in co-operation with the provinces."

I shall leave that for now, just so the house may familiarize itself with the objective. However, in speaking to the motion that is before us at this time, may I say that I was somewhat drawn into the debate by the hon. member for Cape Breton South when he had occasion to read a certain letter to the members of the house. It came from Langley Greenhouses Limited at Langley Prairie, British Columbia. I am more familiar than is the hon. member with the constituency in which is the city of Langley Prairie. He had these remarks to make with respect to the problem that faces Canada today in connection with the coal industry:

This company believed that when the Trans Mountain pipe line went in there they were going to get cheap fuel. Once the other form of energy was eliminated oil prices began to rise. This is the trouble with having all your eggs in one basket.

Mr. Speaker, the implication left by the hon. member was that there was no other fuel available in that area. Nothing could be farther from the truth. We find that there is propane, butane or rather methane, natural gas, the coal which comes both from Nanaimo and from the coal fields of Crowsnest as well as wood and other fuel products and oil from which to choose. Possibly this company of which the hon. member spoke did not take the precaution to discover first just exactly what the cost of conversion was

going to amount to in changing from coal to oil, which it is now using, with the result that it is costing it more money. But to suggest that today there are no other fuels available in that area in competition with oil is completely wrong.

One of the questions having to do with our natural resources, of course, is this question of forest and forest products. Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of the house to the fact that a great number of misstatements have been made and a great deal of concern has been expressed in this chamber and elsewhere across the country with respect to the use of forest products today. In my own province, which gets at least one-half or more of its income from the forest industry, we find an alarming state of affairs.

My purpose in bringing this matter forward at this moment is this. The purpose of conservation of our natural resources is the development of those natural resources. We find that our lumber industry is being extremely hard hit at this time for several reasons. The tight-money policy of this government is one of the most important. There are other reasons as well. One of them is the sale of our products in the export market. So we have both our domestic and our export market lost to a major degree. This can mean only one thing, namely that the people of the province of British Columbia are going to suffer undue hardships because of the financial policy which has been adopted by this government.

I refer first to the export policy. In this connection I have a clipping from the *British Columbian* of January 17, 1957, which is headed "Many Factors Hit B.C. Sales". It goes on to give the observations of Mr. H. A. Renwick, president of the British Columbia lumber manufacturers' association, and reads in part as follows:

Dealing first with the United Kingdom market, Mr. Renwick said:

"During recent years B.C. coast mills have exported approximately 25 per cent of their coast lumber production to United Kingdom.

"Until recently 30 per cent of U.K. present consumption of softwoods went into the manufacture of wooden cases.

"The use of substitutes for wood is making great inroads into the container trade there as it has done during the last two decades on this continent.

"We must be eternally vigilant with regard to the end-use of our sawn lumber. Substitutes of high quality are making inroads every year.

That is a phase, of course, that naturally should be dealt with by the research board. The government as such, in co-operation with industry in my province and in other provinces which have a lumber industry, as well as with the provinces themselves, must find the means whereby they can keep this