opposed to the principle of each job that provides employment, particularly new employment having a cost factor. But I think we have been given a lot of malarky over the last five or six years about the development of our industrial incentive program.

Originally, we decided we would designate areas that obviously could benefit greatly from secondary industry. Then, we developed the idea of slow growth areas. Now, we are saying that anyone who wants to build a factory, and who can meet the criteria, even if he is establishing in one of our major cities, will be able to take advantage of the program.

There is another matter that has concerned me with respect to the department. No doubt there have been a lot of personality problems. Originally, we established the Department of Industry, which has become the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, with some of its responsibilities being transferred to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and during that time we drew together a body of people fully suited for the job that should be done. Many of them, however, have become dissatisfied, and a number of them have quit. There has been much transferring of personnel in both departments. Some of the blame for this should fall on Parliament itself. If we were able to develop the expertise, but were not able to get full value from the program, the value which we anticipated, part of the responsibility must fall on Parliament. For that reason, this kind of amending bill is not satisfactory. Sure, you give $12 million more. So what? Big deal! If we apply the incentive program to Montreal, so what? Big deal! If we apply it to South Shore and Cornwall—big deal! There is no suggestion that they should not get the advantage of it. Maybe every city and town in Canada should get that advantage. Maybe it should apply right across the board. I am not opposed to that, but I think that as a Parliament we should decide what we want to accomplish.

I think there are two things that people want in regional development. The first is that they wish to decentralize industry. They want to provide something for communities that are in a period of flux, whether they be one-time farm communities, or mining communities where the mining industry is defunct, or industrial areas where because of technological change there is great unemployment. Certainly, the industrial development program should aid such communities but, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no advantage in moving people from one area to another area in which they will also find themselves unemployed, and where they will be unable to cope with their changed environment. People who are moved leave behind them assets that they and their parents spent a lifetime developing. They may move into a new area where they cannot be assimilated, and where they will incur fantastic expense to develop an equality, in the social amenities comparable with those which they had in the community they left.

Anyone who suggests that our present system, under which young people in the mid-Canada corridor are trained only to go to the city of Toronto to become displaced persons, to become the unemployed and the

23568—54½

disadvantaged, is good must be pretty stupid. Yet that is what we are doing.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, even the Liberal party, undemocratic as it is—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peters: Even the Liberal party, as indicated by the resolutions at its recent convention, was of the opinion that we must do something about Canadian ownership and Canadian direction of our industry. I say that is undemocratic, Mr. Speaker, because the convention does not relate to the Liberal cabinet benches. It does not relate to the backbenchers of the party when they stand up and vote, because they will vote as one voice. A backbencher in the Liberal party is only here to vote—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: I say that, Mr. Speaker, knowing full well as I look across at the Liberal benches that those members are just as smart as anybody else in the House; they are just as capable as anybody else in this House. They participate in committees and express the views of their constituents in those committees. They make suggestions in private that express the views of their constituents, but when they stand up in this House they vote exactly the way the cabinet wants them to do. They disregard their own points of view. They disregard the constituents they represent. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we are getting pretty poor legislation. One year ago we passed the main incentives Act. Now, we are amending it in some specifics. Mr. Speaker, we are interested in developing Canadian industry. We are interested in having control of our Canadian economy. I am quite sure most of my colleagues in this party will agree that they do not have all the answers. I do not think anybody has all the answers, but we should put our heads together and decide on ways to regain control of our economy.

This is not something which is held as desirable by one particular party or group. The Canadian public are in favour of achieving this, and they are looking to Parliament in order to get control of Canadian industrial development. One of the ways we can create industry is through the incentives Act. We are providing a carrot to industries to expand, to create employment, and we will provide the carrot almost any place.

The minister used a couple of examples in committee. I would like to refer to one of them, McCain Industries Ltd. The minister pointed out that McCain's does not need money. I am not sure why it does not need money. It is true that its plants and factories are fairly well developed. From my limited knowledge of New Brunswick, I think most of the development there has been by McCain Industries Limited. They have been well treated by that province but they are competent people and have done an excellent job. The company was faced with a decision about whether to move into the Boston market for frozen potato chips and they decided to do it. The government was involved in determining whether the