

opment and expansion of this nation is different from the makeup of any other committee of the House of Commons. Most committees proceed in an orderly and quiet way. This committee, I think, is mainly noted for the fractiousness of its members. There is a reason for their fractiousness. Every member of that committee is concerned about overcoming this matter of regional disparities, and every one of them becomes terribly excited. That is because not one member of the committee can be certain whether the matter being considered will, in the end, achieve something amounting to justice for all Canadians. Perhaps that is why debates on regional economic disparities in this House and in Committees tend to be much more heated than debates on almost any other subject under the sun. I have thrown out, those remarks because they underline a philosophical thought.

I wish to make two or three points, and I will be brief. Professor Brewis appeared before the committee and told us things that I think ought to be considered by the minister and his advisers. He said:

The Bill leaves me with a feeling of considerable uneasiness. It introduces what seems to be a major reorientation of policy in the direction of measures to reduce cyclical unemployment rather than measures to improve the long-run economic potential of the less favoured regions of the country.

That is fair indictment, and all of us ought to consider it. The APEC Newsletter in my hand says that, "When everything is designated, nothing is designated." Professor Brewis puts it this way:

The proportion of the population falling within designated regions of one sort or another will be increased from $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$. As a result the efficacy of the legislation to aid the formerly designated areas will be diluted.

For my third point, I wish to quote from the APEC Newsletter. I hope hon. members of the House realize I am trying to be brief. I am not trying to present an ordered argument. I am merely trying to put my case on record in the hope that it will deliver its punch whenever a program such as this is reviewed, as it must be, over a long period of time. The APEC Newsletter reads:

Another change in the DREE program may be more use to this region: that is extending guarantees of loans to manufacturing and larger commercial operations, including convention, hotel, office and shopping projects. This may relieve the provincial governments to some extent.

I hope that it will, Mr. Speaker. I continue to read:

On the other hand, this innovation also smacks of being hastily contrived to meet short-term needs only. Mr. Marchand should explain if assistance to commercial operations is to be a permanent feature of his program or if it, too, is to be dismantled when the immediate problems have passed.

I think the minister might try meeting that point when he speaks on third reading.

If the former, then a significant change in emphasis has taken place in DREE, the whole thrust of which has been to promote the development of secondary industry in designated areas. If secondary industry is now to be de-emphasized, relatively at least, a full and frank disclosure of DREE's reasoning should be given.

Regional Development Incentives Act

Again, Mr. Speaker, the minister will have the opportunity of meeting that point in a moment or two.

As long as uncertainty about DREE's basic philosophy of economic development remains, neither the private sector nor the provincial governments will be able to do any long-range planning.

I make these points because I think they are vital. They will have to be answered some time. Hopefully, they will be answered soon. We hope we will approve of the answers.

Finally, sir, I shall trespass on ground on which it is terribly dangerous for people to trespass. This legislation seeks to do what we have said over and over again must be done. It seeks, in part, to solve the economic problems that are bedeviling many young people in Quebec. I know this is tender ground to tread on, and I know that I am stepping over a quagmire that most people would not come near. I say that if we are spending millions or hundreds of millions of dollars in trying to solve the serious difficulties of that province, there ought to be no monkeying around with the language rights of Canadians in that province! I do not want to think that we, in this Parliament, are pouring out money that will be directed to certain people because they speak only one language or the other. We, in this Parliament, are committed to the full concept of federalism, and we are committed therefore to the concept that a person has the right to speak either one of the two official languages of Canada. Therefore, let no government say that the money can only be used to provide jobs for people who speak only one of the two official languages of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I understand that it requires 15 Senators to make up a quorum in the other place. I think, if we are really sincere in passing the best type of legislation, we should do our utmost to make sure that both Houses of Parliament consider this bill in depth. It affects the various areas of Canada. I, therefore, hope to hear right now that the members of the other place are willing to give this matter study in depth.

An hon. Member: What a hope.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The other place is asleep already.

Mr. Skoberg: I consider myself, first, to be a Canadian. My ancestors come from another country. My father, who came from Sweden, has experienced circumstances such as we are experiencing in Canada at this time. I believe that many people will be interested in reading a book that is now available in the library which deals with some economic aspects of Canada. I am referring to the book by Professor Gunnar Adler-Karlsson on the subject of reclaiming the Canadian economy. I think the minister ought to read this book, and then examine the legislation