

*Supply*

Mr. Speaker, I think that says it all. The Government, in the largest single wealth producing sector of this country, is only prepared to put back 5 per cent. I think that is shameful. One final point just to sum it up, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member's time has expired, unfortunately.

**Mr. Fulton:** Just one more point.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Does the Hon. Member have unanimous consent of the House to continue his remarks?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There appears to be unanimous consent.

**Mr. Fulton:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. It is a very short point and I will be very quick, pointing out that Canada now imports telephone poles from Finland and railway ties from Malaysia. The quotation of Sir John A. MacDonald of June 22, 1871 is appropriate with which to end my speech:

The sight of the immense masses of timber passing my window every morning constantly suggests to my mind the absolute necessity there is for looking into the future of this great trade. We are recklessly destroying the timber of Canada, and there is scarcely a possibility of replacing it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Are there Hon. Members rising to ask questions of the Hon. Member who has just spoken?

**Mr. Nickerson:** I have a question for the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), Mr. Speaker. He proposes a very ambitious program, one which in general terms, I am sure, most Members of the House could support to some degree. He would like to see further processing of logs in Canada. He would like to see a good deal more reforestation and attention given to forest lands. If these programs were to be implemented it would undoubtedly be pretty expensive. Has the Member given any attention to how these programs might be financed? Would he expect additional taxation on the forest industry so that Governments could then carry out these programs? Would he further worsen the deficit by spending existing Government revenues without increasing taxation in any way? What would be his approach to the financing of these ambitious programs?

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to respond to that. The figures that I put on the record make it quite clear. Of the \$3 billion in direct revenue taxation that the Provinces, the Territories and the federal Government are bringing in, only 5 per cent is right now going back into any kind of forestry programs. I am talking here about university level programs relating to silviculture, reforestation, investigation into pesticides and so on. The Government is putting in less than 5 per cent. That revenue is already being brought in so that right now there is \$3 billion that I see as being very readily earmarked without changing the level of taxation of anyone in this country, including that of the industry. That money should be first applied to the programs.

• (1700)

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, I come from an urban area, as most Members of the House now do, where we have cut down our trees. We know about the forests from what we see from the plane or the train. We also know about them from Canadian literature and the music of singers such as Gordon Lightfoot and Bruce Cockburn who write about the wilderness. I think people from urban areas are aware of our forests.

I know that the Member is perhaps the only Member in the House who actually lives in a log cabin in Tlell, British Columbia. What kinds of jobs are available in the forest industry for urban people if, in fact, the Government did what the Hon. Member suggested, which is to undertake, as also suggested by the Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson), an ambitious program of upgrading the forest industry in this country? What kinds of jobs could people in my riding expect to get from this industry that perhaps they are not getting already?

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, the studies that have been completed both by the Association of the British Columbia Professional Foresters and the Science Council of Canada indicate that for every one job there is in the bush, which includes skidder operators, buckers, fallers and people involved in silviculture, road construction, pulp mills and saw mills, which jobs are in rural Canada and mostly in northern Canada and British Columbia, there are two spin-off jobs as a result of the nature of the forest industry. In some Provinces it is 1.7, but across Canada it is roughly two.

When I am talking about a major ambitious program in terms of forestry, moving at least that initial \$3 billion into the forest sector and silviculture in order to get those backlogged lands into a growth process, there is an indirect spin-off of two jobs for everyone whether in Vancouver-Kingsway, Edmonton, Regina or anywhere in the country. I think that is the important point that needs to be made to people in urban areas. It is the urban lethargy in this country that is creating the devastation in rural areas.

An example of that is the new proposal in British Columbia, in order to try to get the industry on its feet again, to cut the environmental ease strips. They are the two chain areas along the edges of streams, lakes and rivers in British Columbia which have been put there for good, sound, scientific and biological reasons in order to protect the fish and enhance the wildlife, including moose, deer and bears. Those are now being proposed to be cut as a quick shot injection into the cash flow of the forest companies in British Columbia. Not only is it chaos, it is fiscally, scientifically and biologically criminal to be involved in those kinds of activities, especially when we see the barrenness that already exists in British Columbia.

One can only conclude that the message is not being given by Members of the House, politicians in the country and the media to urban Canadians that it is important to help the forest industry. It is important for the House to take it more seriously. This is only the second time in four years that this vital issue has been debated. As my colleague pointed out, I