

Supply—Industry

the minister, this parliament or this program will live to see it. What do we do about the situation? We did not think there was going to be an election last year, but rather that we were going to have a recess. We had the assurance of the minister that something would be done about the situation immediately after we returned at the end of the recess. He was reluctant to give us his assurance in that regard, or that is the way it appeared. In any event he said, as reported in *Hansard* at page 3125 on June 30, 1965:

I have assured a number of members, and I am glad to assure the house, that the government will table at the opening of the next part of the session the order in council designating the areas and will endeavour at an early date thereafter to refer the order in council to the house committee on industry, research and energy development for discussion.

I do not think there has been any attempt to table this, nor do I think there has been much attempt to discuss it. If the minister wishes to live up to his commitments, we would be happy to have him state that he is going to do that now. We would be pleased if he would also indicate that sessional paper 1981, which sets up the regulation for development incentives that affect designated areas, will also be referred to a committee. Perhaps that would be sufficient to satisfy our requests. If he is not prepared to do that, I am left with only one alternative. I must take the only action that is available to a member of parliament. I will have to beat this thing to death and bore this house and government until something is done. That action is not fair to other members of the house, but it is one of two alternatives available to back-bench members: They can either move a motion to reduce the estimates of a department or, in some way, force a discussion on the matter which will bring about a situation that may not be satisfactory to anyone.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I am not sure which proposition is the least unreasonable or the least unfair; but I believe it is vital that we in Canada find a solution to the problems presented by centralization, and arrest the flow of people from areas dependant on primary products to the major cities, which are centres not of production but of consumption. Not everyone will be interested in this question. Farmers will not be greatly interested. Many of them have not even considered it. I was always interested to hear people in the west say that the C.C.F. government had chased all the people out of Saskatchewan. I think they would find that

[Mr. Peters.]

Saskatchewan is no different from any other agricultural area in this respect. Every time a farmer doubles his acreage something has to be done about the man who was sitting next door before the amalgamation took place. There is bound to be a large displacement of the agricultural population and a search for new types of employment.

Yet, this is, basically, not a physical problem. This is not a difficulty which cannot be solved. It has been faced by France for at least 300 years. Why do not those people of French extraction who are so anxious to protect the provincial autonomy take a look at what has happened in France as a means of decentralizing and maintaining a national industrial development program which would keep people at work in all segments of the country, rather than concentrate them in one or two areas?

This problem has been tackled in England. It is well known to the government. Why will the minister not consider what has been done in England to decentralize industry? Why is the minister not interested in deciding that it would be better for the people of Canada if certain industries were located in one area rather than another? Possibly he does not know what has been happening in other countries; but I think he does. He must therefore have a reason for not giving us the benefit of his views. If he has not studied this question, I can assure him the senior officials of his department have done so. They are well aware of what has happened in other countries and of the difficulties which have arisen with regard to our own arrangements—difficulties which will make them inoperative in most of the areas they are designed to serve.

Some have suggested that the designation of northern Ontario rather than Manitoulin island would not necessarily bring industry into the region. I am not saying that designation is the complete answer. But, should all of northern Ontario be designated, I know of three major companies which would go into that part of the country. Why? Not because they particularly want to move into the area, but for the simple reason that this is where they find their raw material. One of these companies is the E. B. Eddy Company which has been sitting on limits in my area for 60 years. They have now been given three years in which to decide whether they will put up a pulp and paper mill. In default of this, they will lose their present limits. The expenditure involved would be considerable—some \$42