

responsibility of the "operating" department to see that they are.

I venture to say, therefore, that it is not wrong for the department to make such grants.

The same member was greatly concerned about the standards council. He was afraid that we were proceeding without legislation. We are not doing that. He will understand quite easily that if we do intend to bring legislation to provide for a standards council, some preliminary work has to be done. I want to reassure him the money is not being spent now, as if the council existed.

The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar was concerned about grants given by my department for research in connection with rapeseed. The situation is the following: The rapeseed crushers and processors in western Canada are attempting to improve the quality of rapeseed oil and meal, so they can compete more effectively with imported oil and meal. In the interests of the rapeseed processors, the department has made a grant to a project which is attempting to reduce the toxicity level in rapeseed oil and meal. This work is being carried out by research groups in the western provinces, and we subsidized it at the level of \$144,000 and supervised it too.

The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby made what I thought was an excellent contribution and I want to thank him for it. I will not involve myself in the philosophical debate of the first two subjects he raised. We might do that at the University of Ottawa or at Carleton one of these nights.

His first point had to do with the distribution of power in contemporary society. This is an interesting subject, but the debate would likely be lengthy. His second point had to do with price fixing. I am more interested tonight in the third one, and that is the relationship between grants for scientific research and development programs on the civilian as opposed to the military side of the industrial spectrum. The hon. member seems to feel that our defence programs will lead to the formation of an industrial military elite in Canada, very much against the interests of democracy. There is no doubt that we are generous in this sector. However, I should like to present some argument in favour of that conduct.

My first point is just to remark that vote 5 is now down from \$37 million to \$32 million. There is a saving of \$5 million over last year.

My second remark has to do also with the fact that funds available from the Department

Supply—Industry

of National Defence for the same objective have gone down substantially from \$60 million in 1959, at the time of the Arrow incident, to about \$15 million at present.

My third point is to underline the fact that the funds are more effectively used now than they were in the past and also to underline that the emphasis is slowly, perhaps not quickly enough to suit the hon. member, moving to the civilian side. In other words, more and more importance is attached to the civilian part of these allocations of funds.

I am quite sure that on reflection, if not at first sight, the hon. member will recognize that advances in technology have very often come from military requirements. Money spent for defence materials has served the civilian side of industry as well. As an example, I would cite the transistor. The development of the transistor was highly subsidized by the United States government and everybody knows it is now one of the main elements in contemporary industrial production.

The PT-6, to which the hon. member also referred—

Mr. Broadbent: May I ask a question?

Mr. Pepin: May I finish first? The PT-6 engine built by United Aircraft near Montreal was developed with funds from vote 5 and vote 20, but half of the sales of these engines are now going to commercial companies. If I recall well, these Canadian motors are now found in 37 countries of the world. This is another example of military expenditure that is now serving the civilian side. The hon. member also knows that the C.N.R. turbo trains running between Montreal and Toronto are powered by the same engine, as are the Twin Otters.

● (8:30 p.m.)

Why do we spend money on defence projects? There are many reasons and I have indicated some. Another reason is that the risk in the defence field is greater than the risk in the civilian field. Also, such expenditures are also made by foreign countries. Hon. members may doubt that we should copy the Democrat government of the United States or the Labour government of the United Kingdom or the Social Democrat government of West Germany. All I can say is that when every other country is doing it, it would be terribly dangerous to be different. Some political parties have tried to but have not succeeded very well. Certainly a country would probably fall flat on its face if it used