

Government Organization

industry which takes advantage of my department's services.

As the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) said, small industries are often located in underdeveloped areas. There is no doubt that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion will apply itself more directly than mine to the problems of at least some of those small businesses.

I might even say that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is especially—I do not say exclusively—responsible for the big industry, so that the government can get, through taxation, the money necessary to deal with underdeveloped areas.

The hon. member also mentioned the dangers or the negative effects of modernization. What I said earlier about the need for industrial rehabilitation applies. As there is retraining for individuals, there should also be some kind of retraining for industries.

The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) is very concerned about the bilingual character of my department. I can assure him that most people mentioned: Messrs. Warren, Kniewasser, Scharzmann, Sénécal and Mundy, are all bilingual. In fact, I am proud to have a department that can work, at least at the upper level in both languages. Therefore, I can reassure the hon. member and all other French-speaking members in the house that if they have to deal with those senior officials, they can start the conversation in French and carry on in French.

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) has raised a question which I find most interesting, to wit the confidential nature of certain government papers. That is, I believe, a controversial matter in the sense that certain papers may readily be made public while the same is not true of others.

I have here a list of the studies done by the department. Some have been made known to the organizations with which they had been undertaken, while others, for obvious reasons, were not distributed. Some interests are involved and even if we are democratically minded, such interest must be protected when, for example, publication of a document may cause economic disturbances which would not be in the best interests of the country.

I suggest that we must be practical, that we must distinguish between the two kinds and that we must act accordingly.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam) has given us the background of the wheat situation. I simply

envy him for having been able to prepare a historical outline as complete as the one he has offered us this afternoon. I would have preferred him to tell me what to do tomorrow. In any event, there will certainly be an opportunity for me tomorrow to tell what I intend to do.

I would like to take perhaps three minutes to answer the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) who brought up a discussion which we had started a few months ago and which, so far as I am concerned, interests me, and even grips my heart.

[English]

We could argue the case on financial grounds. We can ask whether one company can get more from civilian programs than from the defence programs of the department. What I said a few months ago in the house, and I quote it, is that "the Canadian industrialists who avail themselves of our programs might get as much from a civilian project as from a defence project". I still maintain that this is possible, and we will have an opportunity, when we study my estimates in the committee, to get down to details and to show that this is true.

• (5:50 p.m.)

However, I do not think that this is the essential difference between the point of view of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby and my own. The real difference is on general ideas. I sympathize with parts of his philosophy, as I have said before. I am in favour also of a shift from the defence aspect to the civilian aspect, inasmuch as this is possible and this is done, too. I am as peaceful as he is, and sometimes perhaps more peaceful than he, at least in my approach to political matters. However, the difference between us is really more basic than that and I wish I had time to go into it. The basic difference is probably in our approach to defence and to foreign affairs. The real debate would consist in asking what form and what degree of involvement Canada should have in world affairs. We would have to start with this basic question in order to come to some kind of conclusion. Then, I would have to say many things about the purpose of the defence programs in my department. May I mention a few, *en passant*. The first is that the defence program is designed to give the best value for the Canadian defence dollar. However, if my hon. friend does not want Canada to spend any money on defence, that brings about an altogether different debate, as I have said. I