

Supply

With all due respect to the hon. member who makes quotations from press releases at a time when the government in office was projecting \$30 billion deficits, times have changed. Any government is forced to see how it can make most effective use of the resources that it has available.

If he has practical suggestions on that or if he would like to come forward and say that he thinks the DIPP fund should be increased by another \$250 million and here is where we take the money from then let him suggest that. So far, other than his ranting and raving I have not heard any specific suggestions from him as to what it is exactly he wants us to do.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, mine is a very brief intervention because I know the time is short. I would ask the minister if he could provide us with the figures on the DIPP program as to how much was invested and what the payback was in the most recent figures he has available.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I could not answer that question off the top of my head but I will certainly undertake to get that information to the hon. member as quickly as possible.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Resuming debate. I will take the occasion to remind all members on both sides of the House that for a member to be given the floor he must seek the floor and of course that means to rise at your chair. We speak about or refer to these unofficial lists that we have, which are somewhat helpful at times, but in the end members seeking the floor of course are those who will be recognized by the Chair.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Mr. Speaker, after reading the Bloc Quebecois motion, I have more questions than anything else. The motion reads as follows:

That this House condemn the government for its unacceptable delays in developing and implementing a genuine strategy for the conversion of defence industries—

This certainly raises questions. I am pleased to say first of all that some of my questions were answered by the first speaker, the Bloc critic, and also by the Minister of Industry.

Before listening to this morning's speech, I had decided that I should speak for the motion for one part and against it for another, based largely on the interpretation of certain key words in the motion.

[English]

In listening to the first speaker, the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, some of the answers came clear to me. One was that first of all he was making a very Bloc Quebecois statement, one that is enshrouded a little in mystery. In fact, it was partly

brought out by the Minister of Industry saying: "Why are they talking about this defence industry when their long term motivation is to withdraw and perhaps have no armed forces at all". That part of it is still a bit of a mystery to me.

• (1120)

I noted also that the speaker talked really only about Quebec. He did mention regionalism. I think regionalism is a very great consideration to all Canadians partly because we do not see sufficient consideration on the part of the government about regionalization or the necessity for developing different regions. We see a total concentration, it seems to me, on one at a time and giving way to political considerations rather than human or industrial ones.

The main question I had in listening to the Bloc spokesman was what is the motivation behind the motion. I think that came very clear that the motivation was to get money for industry in Montreal. I do not think that is sufficient. Perhaps it needs money. Perhaps it needs help. Perhaps it needs government leadership. However, to just say: "Let's have more money for Montreal or for Quebec" is not acceptable. It should be put in the context of what is needed in the rest of the country.

I heard the statement by the Minister of Industry in response. I have to say that the thrust of his statement was good. I did agree with a good part of what he said. He said there should be no question of just giving cheques to industry, that industry must take the initiative itself.

I would put a little caveat in here in saying that the government must show some leadership for industry, but the minister said it correctly in saying that the defence market has to take care of its own. It has to be market driven and, he said very clearly, there must be no major subsidies or bailouts. I could not agree more with what the minister says in that regard. He wound up in effect saying the whole process must be industry led. I agree with that also.

Having in a cursory manner described what I heard from both of these presentations on the part of the Bloc and on the part of the government, I have to admit that my own thought processes on this process were much more objective. I am looking at the context of the world situation, of Canada's foreign policy, Canada's defence policy and what industry has to do within that whole milieu.

Let us see how objective I am.

[Translation]

The motion introduced by the Bloc Quebecois refers to unacceptable delays in developing a genuine strategy.