

premier of Saskatchewan did at one time when he tried to save a box factory and a shoe factory? If any kind of business is in danger of going under, will they rush in, take it over and give it large injections of money? What will they do?

If they want to leave the impression that they are friends of small business, that when the Tory millennium arrives there will not be a single bankruptcy in Canada because the Tory party will take care of it, this is nonsense. This does a terrible disservice to small business generally. Small business needs assistance. My leader pointed out one important area in which we can provide assistance to small business, that is, by providing low interest rates. There are other things we can do. But to start talking about making money grants in order to induce people into small business creates chaos and does a terrible disservice to small businessmen. The effect of that will be to destroy small business, not to help it.

There are examples where a certain kind of endeavour was offered subsidies. Do you think we are short of dress shops and barber shops in this country? I notice that the Leader of the Opposition did not exclude the retail trade, where the bulk of small business is, so I presume he will hand out all kinds of largesse to anyone who wants to open up. That will be a great thing. If we suffer from anything, we suffer from a surfeit of shopping centres, a surfeit of stores, which makes it difficult for the legitimate businessman to survive and to continue making some kind of profit from his energies and efforts.

The kind of solution that is being offered by the Conservative party is a pack of nonsense. If they took the time to talk to a small businessman, the kind of man they say they are concerned about, they would find he has problems and he deserves to be assisted, but the kind of proposals that are coming from the Conservatives are not what he wants. I do not want to be unkind, but there is one remark that I think deserves comment. It was made by the Leader of the Opposition. He said something to the effect that we have to encourage individual initiative. I am all for individual initiative, but we are not living in the age of Marie Chapdelaine any more, that great Hungarian hero.

Some hon. Members: Oh, Oh!

Mr. Saltzman: We really have to look at this sort of assumption, that you pull yourself up by your bootstraps in a modern society. Again I say I am not saying this in an unkind way, and I hope it is not taken so. I am sure that when the Leader of the Opposition was premier of Nova Scotia he did everything he could to encourage initiative in the Nova Scotian people. I am sure the people of Nova Scotia are not without initiative. But what point is there to the encouragement of initiative when there are so many things going against that province?

I am not holding the former premier of the province to blame and I am not saying he did not try, but when he says that individual initiative must be encouraged, surely his own experience belies that statement. Did he, as premier of that province, refuse federal grants whenever they came along? Did he say, "No. That might do something to our initiative. I will have none of that"? Did we hear him say that we should get rid of all the DREE programs because they destroy the initiative of the people

Effect of Budgetary Proposals

on the Prairies? On the contrary, he says that we are callous and that we are unfaithful to the people in the Maritimes when we oppose these programs.

• (2050)

I am dealing with the motion before us, Mr. Speaker, and if some of my remarks are sharp—

An hon. Member: They are not too pointed.

Mr. Saltzman: —and some unkindness creeps through them, is not as much as this motion deserves but—

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Saltzman: Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to receive the question at the end of my allotted time. I felt that there was one great omission in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. He did not dwell on wage and price controls, although they seem to have been the most important item to him up to this point. I do not know if it is because his friends in Alberta have pointed out to him that if he were to bring in such a program, he would have to go to the premier of Alberta and tell him that he could not double the price of gas to the people of Ontario.

I am not sure what happened. I do not know whether some of the farmers, who for the first time in many years are getting some sensible prices after all their work, have asked him if he thinks it is the time to bring in wage and price controls when they are trying to make a living. All mention of price controls was conspicuous by its absence. I hope that was not inadvertent; I hope he is going to drop it altogether, because it will not work unless he wants to be grossly unfair to many people in this country.

Some of my hon. friends have suggested that perhaps I should conclude on a more positive note—

An hon. Member: You should not have started.

Mr. Saltzman: What should be done in fact, Mr. Speaker? One of the things that has to be done, and I wonder whether my friends of the Conservative party would agree with this—

An hon. Member: You have no friends here.

Mr. Saltzman: —is to curtail the export of all raw material and energy supplies from Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltzman: There was a time when it was thought that a budget deficit in itself would create employment and prosperity. I do not think that is the case any longer. There are many other factors involved in creating employment now, but as long as this country continues to export raw materials and energy supplies it is not going to provide employment, regardless of the size of the budget deficit. All we are really doing is trading off irreplaceable raw materials that we may very well need in the future for manufactured goods. It is a bad trade, Mr. Speaker. Nor is the answer to more employment what the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) suggested, more business