

*Regional Development Incentives Act*

the list of motions before us. Therefore I would suggest that both motions be discussed at the same time. My suggestion would be that all motions be withheld until the last and if we are to have votes on them that all the votes be taken together on all the motions.

I might add that I have serious reservations about the last motion, No. 8. If hon. members are prepared at this time to indicate to the Chair their views about this proposed motion I would be pleased to hear from them in this regard. My view is that perhaps this proposed motion introduces a financial provision into the bill which is not covered by the recommendation of the Crown. I would have a tendency not to put that motion to the house after we have concluded debate on the first seven motions.

Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rising to speak to the point of order in respect of motion No. 8?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I was hesitating for a moment to see whether the hon. member for Regina East might return to his place. Speaking for those of us in this party who have looked at these motions, I think I can say that our general view is that your approach to these eight motions is a very proper one. If it is the judgment of the Chair that motion No. 1 and motion No. 2 should be combined for debate and that No. 8 should not be considered because of the expenditure question we would be inclined to agree with that ruling. Rather than take the time of the house to argue the matter we would accept the decision of the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker:** In view of the hon. member's comments we will proceed to the consideration of the first motion, it being understood that motions Nos. 1 and 2 will be considered at the same time for purposes of debate.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask for clarification? When it comes to putting the motions in respect of these amendments will it be the plan to take the motion on amendment No. 1 first and then, depending on what happens to the first motion, the motion in respect of the second amendment would be put?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes. We would put the motions consecutively before the house starting with the one standing in the name of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby)** moved:

That Bill C-202, An Act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions in Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment, be amended, by deleting in clause 2, section (f), all the words after the word "of" in line 13 of page 2, and by substituting therefor the words: "all forms of industrial activity."

He said: In speaking on this motion, Mr. Speaker, I should first of all point out that if one reads at the outset the purpose of this bill he will see that it is described as an act to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment. This is a very broad conceptual description of the purpose of this bill. Members of this party are in full agreement with this broad description.

If one turns to clause 2(f), however, which I shall not read at this point, it will be found that what the government has in mind in effect is not really to provide funds for industrial expansion in the sense that term is now used by most modern economists and most people concerned with regional development, but in fact is concerned with manufacturing centres. So the central concept of the government in designating a certain area as being a growth centre, for example, really means a manufacturing centre. Therefore we in this party think there is a very important restriction right at the outset in this bill. We believe it is the kind of restriction which should be removed because, as I pointed out, we are in sympathy with the broader purpose of the bill as stated in its title.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Therefore my amendment to the bill restores what has already been stated to be its purpose at the outset, namely, to deal with regional economic disparity by providing incentives for industrial expansion, not just manufacturing expansion. That kind of thinking, as I tried to point out when the bill was at the committee stage, is really outmoded in my judgment and certainly in the judgment of many professional people concerned with the question of regional development.

Let me quote one source in this regard. In an article written recently by two economists on the subject of regional development they