

Supply

Council of Canada, to provide leadership in research in such areas as basic research, forest production and, most importantly, to ensure that adequate forest protection research is conducted. As well, the Government should work for additional federal-provincial research agreements. I believe the Minister told us the other day that there are federal-provincial agreements in place with only two or three Provinces. There is some difficulty with the major producing Provinces and that certainly must be overcome. As well, the Science Council of Canada calls on the Government to stimulate investment in research, provide priorities and co-ordinate research opportunities, to develop more support for forestry schools and also to provide more long-term funding for university research.

I urge the Minister to give serious attention to our call today for the creation of a Minister of Forestry and to consider a meeting of Ministers responsible for forests as early as possible.

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to accept and commend the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) for his ideals and goals with respect to the forest industry. In his remarks he mentioned Sweden several times and compared us to that country.

Would the Hon. Member indicate to the House whether he would prefer to see Canadians go the route of higher taxation in order to achieve this billion dollar input into the forest industry, which he laments we are not doing, or would he prefer to see us go the route which Sweden is increasingly taking, which is asking their people to become more involved in their own social programs by increasing their contributions as individuals to their social programs?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to that question because it is a critical one. How do we involve people in the forest industry in a more meaningful way? I will respond by making two points very quickly.

First, we will not become a competitive country in the forest industry until we involve all employees in a meaningful way in the forest industry. To a large extent, we are still of the neanderthal viewpoint that there are bosses and there are workers in the forest industry. Our competing countries no longer possess that attitude. Until we democratize the workplace and involve all employees in a meaningful way in the production of our forest products, we will not develop to our maximum in terms of competitiveness and productivity.

● (1210)

A first step in the right direction that we could learn from our colleagues south of the line in the United States of America is profit sharing involving all employees, not just senior executives. This would be a major step toward real democratization of the workplace.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, I have a follow-up question to my friend from Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis). It seems to me there have been some very major efforts to democratize the work force but they have for the most part been resisted by the

leadership of the Canadian Labour Congress. Would the Hon. Member be prepared to agree that there is a need for a change of attitude at the highest leadership level in the Canadian Labour Congress on this labour-management democratization?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that question. I am not aware of any leader of any of the labour unions of this country that has not advocated such a position. I have yet to see a single incident—and I watch this very closely—when management has made a genuine offer of involvement that was not taken up by the employees. I have yet to see a single incident when such an officer was turned down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Are there any further questions or comments? The Hon. Minister for the Environment.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity for this debate. It will be difficult to say things very novel in view of the debate that took place yesterday, but I will try. I also express the hope that a debate of this kind will take place in the respective provincial legislatures across Canada.

I was pleased to notice that the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) did recognize that there is in the matter of forestry a very heavy and important burden to be carried on by provincial jurisdictions. Perhaps I might also be so bold as to express the hope that a debate of this kind will also take place by boards of directors in the forest industries that have benefited so far. If things are done properly in the future we will continue to benefit if this industry and resource is managed properly. It seems to me, however, that the Hon. Member is engaging in a doubtful exercise of mixing figures when he begins to compare a federal responsibility like the weather services with expenditures made in forestry, which is a joint responsibility. I would urge him not to do that.

The Hon. Member also seems to overlook the fact—and I wish he were more *au courant* as to what is happening—that we do have a number of agreements in place in addition to the ones with Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. These are agreements made jointly, federally and provincially, under DREE some years ago which have resulted in a contribution by the federal Government to the Provinces in the neighbourhood of some \$80 million or \$82 million a year.

I am looking for a moment at the motion before us today. The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap makes two propositions. One is the creation of a new ministry. Long speeches could be made on this subject. If the creation of a new ministry will result in the planting of one more tree, I would be quite positive to that kind of proposal. But it seems to me today that, given a golden opportunity to do so, the Hon. Member from Kamloops-Shuswap failed to make a good case for the creation of a new ministry. He really did. I did not hear in his remarks any substantiating evidence that by creating a new ministry our country would benefit through the planting