

Supply—Industry

involved here. It is not a question of deciding whether we are going to have the metric system, whether we are going to have standard sizes for ladies dresses or whether we are going to have standards for electrical motors. The principle involved here is this, that the minister should present some form of legislation, so we know what is involved in a standards council of Canada. Then, I think the house would be only too happy to pass the vote for \$80,000, or whatever it takes. However, I do not think we should pass the vote for \$80,000 when we do not know what it is for, or what form the legislation is going to take. This was my point in asking that vote 3 should not be agreed to at the moment, but that we could proceed with the other items. The minister may wish to enlarge on what I have said.

The Chairman: Is it the wish of the committee, then, that vote 3 stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pepin: I have accepted the suggestion made by my hon. friend, so I do not think there should be any difficulty in dropping it.

Mr. Hales: By "dropping it", you mean there is no item of \$80,000 in there, I take it? Is that agreed?

The Chairman: There are certain procedural difficulties that have arisen at this point, and I should like to consult with the officers at the table. There is some uncertainty in the mind of the Chair as to exactly what agreement has been arrived at between the minister and the hon. member for Wellington. Perhaps the minister would like to explain, so we would be in a better position to make a decision.

Mr. Pepin: I will take the contrary position. As I understand it, the hon. member and the committee would be willing to pass vote 3 with the exception of the \$80,000 assigned to the national standards association, so perhaps we could do it that way without getting into procedural difficulties.

Mr. Hales: If it might assist the Chair, I shall withdraw my motion in view of the suggestion made by the minister.

Amendment (Mr. Hales) withdrawn.

The Chairman: This, then, involves a procedural difficulty in that another minister has to move that the item be reduced by the sum of \$80,000. If possible the Chair would like a motion to that effect.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question?

An hon. Member: Sit down. You are not a minister.

The Chairman: Order. Perhaps we may clear up this temporary procedural impasse before we move on.

Mr. Davis: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready to debate the motion?

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I should like further clarification of the minister's explanation regarding the \$150,000 vote in 1967-68.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): As I was entering the chamber I understood the minister to say that this \$150,000 would be carried over. I also heard a reference to the fact that it would be added to the \$80,000.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Chairman, I said that the \$150,000 was not spent and was returned to the receiver general. This is an entirely new item, and we have now agreed to pass vote 3 with the exception of this amount of \$80,000 for the national standards association.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I should like to know whether this \$150,000 has been spent. It is my understanding that any vote not used last year cannot in any way, shape or form be spent again by the government unless it is reintroduced in this house in the proper way. If \$150,000 was not spent last year, then it should not be spent in some other way without being reintroduced.

Mr. Pepin: This is why we introduced a new vote for \$80,000.

Amendment (Mr. Davis) agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall vote 3 as reduced pass?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Item agreed to.

(The following items were agreed to:)

5. To develop and sustain the technological capability of Canadian defence industry for the purpose of defence export sales or civil export sales arising from that capability