

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

terms of principle, in terms of constitutional theory, in terms of the parliamentary legislative process, is completely wrong, and for that reason it should not be in here.

The minister can say, as she did, that it is not absolute because any session can amend a statute of a previous session. Whom are we kidding, then, by having it in the bill? I think there are better ways for the Canadian people to arrive at an understanding. I think our traditions, our practices can be guaranteed, but let us not mess up our own legislation; let us not anticipate our problems of constitutional amendment by this kind of clause. I think, Mr. Chairman, that clause 115 ought not to be in this bill.

The Chairman: Shall the clause carry?

Mr. Pugh: No, Mr. Chairman.

[Translation]

Mr. Perron: Mr. Chairman, before clause 115 is passed, I wish to say that I quite understand the attitude of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who seems unwilling to leave to the provinces the right to exercise their veto with regard to the application of this legislation.

When one has studied the policy of the party to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre belongs, one realizes that it is the party which favours most strongly centralization.

In view of the fact that my colleague from Mégantic (Mr. Langlois) was telling me a little earlier that he will have several questions to ask about clause 115, may I point out that it is ten o'clock.

[Text]

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

FORESTRY—REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENTAL LABORATORIES TO SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. J. H. Addison (York North): Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of the house because on Tuesday morning I was presented with a resolution from the town of Richmond Hill which reads in part as follows:

That the mayor and clerk be requested to write to the Honourable Maurice Sauvé, Canada Department of Forestry, Mr. John Addison, M.P. and Mr. A. MacKenzie, M.P.P. requesting an explanation as to why the government policy, concerning

the location of the department of lands and forest laboratories is being revised in Ontario by Mr. Sauvé.

On February 18 a news release was issued by the minister's office which said, in part:

To establish our regional headquarters near the centre of major forestry activity is, I feel, a sound decision, Mr. Sauvé said.

He is referring here to establishing the Department of Forestry at Sault Ste. Marie.

All the various factors were carefully weighed and we consulted with all of those involved.

In my question on Tuesday and also today I pointed out that the recommendations of the Glassco commission suggested in volume 4, under the forestry section, beginning on page 243:

The Department of Forestry has been operational only since 1960, when it was formed by transfer of units from other departments. For this reason no valid judgment can be made on the effectiveness of the new research organization, and your commissioners restrict themselves to the following observations:

And on page 244 it goes on to say this:

Many laboratories are not located at research or academic institutions, with the consequence that scientific staffs are isolated.

As recorded in *Hansard* of Friday, February 1, 1963 at page 4310 the then minister of forestry, Hon. J. R. Nicholson had this to say:

During the relatively short time I have been minister, I have had inquiries seeking information on the department's policy in selecting locations for laboratories. I mention this because the Glassco report commented on the fact that our laboratories were removed from research and from academic institutions and suggested this was undesirable isolation. In principle, I expect that any man of science would agree with that observation. But it must be remembered that the federal Department of Forestry is a unique organization. Responsibility for managing the forests lies with the provinces. When we undertake research, this work has to tie in with the work being done by the departments of lands and forests of the various provinces.

Then he went on to say:

It is of the utmost importance that our research officers work in close harmony and proximity with the forest services of the different provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta recognized this and moved its forestry research centre from the city of Calgary to Edmonton, the capital. Saskatchewan and Manitoba, who share facilities, moved their laboratory from Saskatoon to Winnipeg. This principle was also followed in New Brunswick and British Columbia. My question is, why is this principle not being followed at the present time in Ontario?