

### Supply

diversify is of little value when it is in the form of a multitude of mini-programs—welcome and as useful as they are—while at the same time the macroeconomic policy of the Government in Ottawa and the Conservative Government in Victoria is eliminating any chance we have for establishing a healthy economy in the long run.

The forest industry in British Columbia is absolutely vital to the economic welfare of every resident of that province. This includes the people of my constituency. However, because of government mismanagement here and government mismanagement in Victoria, we are left with a residue of over-mature forests and little effective reforestation. We are left with seedlings, because of budget cuts, that are dying before they get to the planting areas. Due to the under-funding of forestry programs by the federal government and the provincial governments, and the industry has neglected this as well, there has been long-term neglect of reforestation, regeneration policies and silviculture. As a result, we see whole communities that are beginning to wither and die. With all of the incentive programs—and I relate more particularly here to the subject matter before us—even with all the acceleration of tax incentive programs over the years, the industry has not seen fit to retool its basic plant, even though the research is available. The industry has known the plywood industry was dying, that the resource was not there to supply the West Coast and the B.C. interior plywood industry, because the nature of the resource has changed as a result of long-term mismanagement.

● (1720)

The technology is there. It is being used in other parts of Canada and in the United States. They are converting plants from plywood to waferboard, to chipboard, to finger-jointing and to a number of product areas where one can utilize the stock that we have remaining in order to produce a viable and economic product that can be marketed. The markets are there. Operations in place in other areas have shown that is the case. Yet with all the incentives and write-offs available to industry, and increasingly available because of the policies of this Government, the industry still has not got off its rear end. It is amazing to listen to the Conservatives to my right suggesting that the answer is to remove Government. "Let us have faith in the private sector... Hallelujah!", they say, "The private sector will do the whole darn thing." But the private sector has not done so. It has failed miserably, even with all the tools the Government has laid open to them. It is not in this case a matter of more research. The private sector has simply failed to do its job.

I listened to the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) a few minutes ago talking about some NDP policy that he must have invented in the far depths of his imagination, that somehow it was our policy to give taxpayers' dollars as grants or incentives to companies to move new mining operations to the South Seas or build huge pulp mills in other parts of the world. I do not know what he has been smoking but I have never heard anyone from this Party suggest that those were appropriate types of policies to be

followed. In fact, we have been in the forefront many times of criticizing the Government across the way for exactly such policies. We continue to do so for its continuing grants and incentives that have allowed both corporate mergers and take-overs on a vastly increasing scale and for subsidizing with Canadian dollars our own competition in other parts of the world.

MacMillan Bloedel, for instance, required no special grants in order to use millions and millions of Canadian-earned dollars to build up competition to its Canadian operations in South America. MacMillan Bloedel did this on its own. Why? Because it is not the prime prerogative of any large corporation to have a national loyalty. They are not bad guys for doing that. MacMillan Bloedel behaved in the way we should expect it to behave. One of the purposes surely of any government is to impose a certain value system on industry operating in this country, that one of its duties aside from serving its shareholders is to be certain that a reasonable share—and certainly it would not be going too far astray to suggest that that should be the major share of the money earned here from our resources and our labour—be reinvested here. We have not only failed to do that but the Conservatives want to encourage that failure even more—to just shovel incentives out. Then the Conservatives will demand at some time that we have more tax incentives to allow all kinds of new fancy research to replace those basic industry jobs that, due to the Conservatives policies, its friends' policies and the corporate sector's policies, we have shipped out of this country by the thousands and thousands over past decades. I cannot understand where they are coming from.

We have shared in the criticism and we have initiated some of that criticism. About mid-1982 I recall asking questions in this House specifically about a special employment incentives program to be administered through the Prime Minister's Office and with all the decisions to be made by key Liberal Senators—I named certain ones in Saskatchewan and British Columbia—which would obviously result in a patronage-ridden system to disburse taxpayers' largesse administered by the Government. We do not like that kind of thing. Nor do we like the type of allocations that are made without any appropriate consultation at the local level so that people in all walks of life can have some share in what makes sense in terms of investment, grant programs and developmental procedures.

It is interesting to look at the record of the Conservative Government, that short blip in 1979, when it wiped out local advisory boards. Then the Liberal Government reinstated them and then it scrapped them again. The PCs will listen to them now. Now Members of Parliament must pay for them out of their own pockets. I do not mind doing that. I would rather pay money out of my own pocket to ensure we have good local input into that kind of decision making than, for the sake of saving a few days' time, relegate all authority to people in the bureaucracy who do not have a clear understanding of what the local needs and priorities are.