

*The Budget—Mr. Kristiansen*

the whole truth, for in the budget tabled in 1983 as well as in the budget tabled in 1984, the Minister of Finance had allocated funds, so that de Havilland and Canadair have sufficient funding to operate. And if they are ever faced with financial problems, they know they can come to the Government or Parliament for additional funding.

[English]

**Mr. Blenkarn:** I am happy to hear, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member thinks they might come to the Government for funding, but he will appreciate that the contingency allowance set out in the Budget is only \$800 million, having been reduced from \$1.1 billion to only \$800 million. With respect to de Havilland and Canadair alone, the amount of money spent this year on those corporations is \$850 million—that is on those two expenditure items alone—and there is no provision in the Budget for those expenditures which are undoubtedly going to take place with those corporations, as they both, as the Hon. Member knows, have funded debt well in excess of \$1.8 billion, and they are both losing money at the rate of \$20 million, \$30 million and \$40 million a month.

Surely the Hon. Member must understand that there has to be an allowance somewhere in the Budget for this contingency expense, but the contingency expense is only \$800 million. How does the Hon. Member then wish to support a budget which does not have a proper contingency allowance, clearly does not foresee expenditures which he knows, and I know, will have to be met? What does he propose to do, sell Canadair, close it down, fire the workers? Is that the Hon. Member's proposal? Is that why there is no contingency allowance for Canadair and de Havilland?

[Translation]

**Mr. Maltais:** Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed when I hear remarks such as those the Hon. Member has just made, blaming the government on the one hand because the deficit is supposedly too high, and blaming it on the other hand because the contingency allowance for Canadair and de Havilland is supposedly not high enough. This is definitely a contradictory statement. The second point, Mr. Speaker, is that both de Havilland and Canadair have the funds they need for the time being. So far, these corporations have not come directly to Parliament for more funding, but if they ever do, I would simply ask the Hon. Member opposite and his colleagues to grant these corporations additional funds. I think, however, that the minister responsible for Crown corporations sought budgetary adjustments a few months ago. Some changes have even taken place within the various Crown corporations to improve administrative performance as well as to recoup our losses, while maintaining the greatest number of people on the work force and making de Havilland and Canadair products more cost efficient and exportable. I think we should be reasonable, and should, at some point in time de Havilland request more funds, I would mention to the Hon. Member that we might have to vote supplementary estimates.

[English]

**Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, before commencing with my remarks on the Budget today, I would first of all like to add a few words to some of the exchanges which went on earlier regarding the retirement of our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Many Hon. Members will recall that some time ago he suggested to some of us in western Canada that we should climb our own mountains. Coming from the constituency of Kootenay West, which has some of the most spectacular mountains and mountain scenery in the country, I had already done so. However, since his remark I have done so again and what I have seen from the tops of mountains in my own constituency and what can be seen from mountain tops in many areas of Canada is not particularly attractive as regards the state of our forest industry. That is the subject which I would like to discuss today.

● (1640)

If you stand on a mountain top, fly by helicopter or light plane, particularly over many of the once forested areas of Canada, you will see many areas which have been cut and laid to waste and not replanted. They have been ignored both by federal Government and by provincial Governments across this land for generations. It is, Sir, a national scandal.

It is sometimes difficult for people in metropolitan areas to appreciate that we are facing large-scale shortages of commercially viable forests in Canada. It has been a deliberate policy of many of our Governments to keep green belts around the highways and keep the scarred areas out of sight beyond the mountain tops. The public generally has thus not been aware of the lasting devastation created. And we have done virtually nothing to redeem it.

In my own province, the unsatisfactorily restocked areas make up some 640,000 hectares. They have been ignored and not replanted. Above and beyond that we have huge areas which have not been effectively managed. We do not thin or fertilize. Any farmer would be absolutely insane to farm in the same way that we handle our forestry resource.

I would just like to run down a short list of headlines which we have seen lately. Some people in Canada have begun to wake up. People in the forest industry, whether they be loggers, mill workers, company spokesmen or foresters, have begun to speak up. Indeed, the public has begun to speak up more and more in the last few years, and the media and some politicians are finally catching on. None of us are without sin in this matter because the claims to priority by many segments of the public often get more attention from many of us than do the long-term demands of our nation and its number one industry—having regard to its contribution to the Canadian economy. There was a headline in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on February 11, 1984, which said "Massive lay-offs seen in B.C. forestry study", and "B.C. lay-offs foreseen". *The Vancouver Sun* of February 11, 1984 carried the headline, "Forests being written off". The article said:

Ottawa and Victoria have "written off" B.C.'s forests jeopardizing more than 60,000 jobs—