

Supply—Industry

do this, then we are going to have to ask the industrial committee to visit other countries. The committee will come back united and decide it is going to run the government. This could be the answer, I do not know. There do not seem to be any readily available answers.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask a question? What did the hon. member mean by visiting other countries and then coming back and running this country that way?

Mr. Peters: I referred earlier to the fact that France, England, Norway and Sweden have developed different types of programs for the decentralization of industry and the distribution of industry rather than allowing people into the industrial centres, wherever they may be. If the committee were to visit Norway, in particular, they would find a very despotic method of deciding where industries should be located. The government makes the decision and if somebody wants to run the industry, that is okay. If nobody wants to do so, then the government puts somebody in to operate it as a crown corporation. The Swedish system is not quite so severe. In England they use the carrot, the stick and two or three different ways. France probably has a much better thought out system for deciding on the distribution of people and industries.

If the committee went to those countries it would probably come back convinced that one of these methods would work, because I believe the members are interested in finding a logical and sensible solution to the problem. The committee would probably recommend legislation containing at least one aspect or a combination of aspects of the controls used in other countries. Then, what is the answer? Do they tell the government what to do? Does the committee force the government to introduce legislation? I am not sure how we do it. I know that this question is important enough to my riding, important enough to every northern riding in every province of this country and to the people in the maritimes, that they are going to have to do something about it. I would strongly urge the minister to stand up and give us some indication of the direction in which he intends to go with this designated program, because it is not working well now.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This is the fourth speaker

[Mr. Peters.]

from parties other than the Conservative party, which has 96 members in the house.

The Deputy Chairman: I wish to thank the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre—

Mr. Churchill: I just draw it to your attention, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman:—for reminding the Chair of the allocation of speakers. There is a certain number of speakers on behalf of the various parties, and the parties were allocated certain times. However, since there were no speakers available at certain periods, I have recognized the hon. member for Villeneuve.

Mr. Churchill: I have been here all day.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Just a few words, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the estimates of the Department of Industry.

The most fantastic point I find in the department's expenditures which amount to \$50,582,400 is the difference between the:

(Fund) to sustain technological capability in Canadian industry by supporting selected defence development programs, on terms and conditions approved by Treasury Board—

A fund which amounts to \$25,000,000 and the:

(Fund) to advance the technological capability of Canadian manufacturing industry by supporting selected civil (non-defence) development projects on terms and conditions approved by Treasury Board—

Mr. Chairman, this latter fund amounts to \$8,700,000.

Now, the government spends four times less money on technological progress concerning non-military Canadian manufactured products than in the field of military defence.

I think it would be a good thing, for the enlightenment of members of Parliament and of the Canadian people, if the minister were to explain this difference, why he spends four times as much for defence as for non-military matters.

Such expenditures might be warranted if a war or some such thing were in the offering but I do not at the moment foresee any immediate conflict with another country; yet the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) is assigning \$25 million for technological development in the field of defence, and only \$8,770,000 for technological development concerning non-military matters.