

The Budget—Mr. Lumley

Mr. Lumley: Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised at the Hon. Member, who comes from the business community and who has been advocating a more streamlined approach. For example, his area will be designated for assistance for the first time that I can ever recall as a businessman. We have cut down the number of programs to seven major programs. We have a very fair, equitable, objective index now which will be updated once a year. Designation will no longer be by ministerial discretion. I thought he would have been one of the first Members in the House to strongly support the initiatives that the Government is going to take in this regard.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows the clothing and textile industries in all the industrialized countries are under tremendous pressure with competition from low wage countries because of the high labour content involved. The Government in recent years has done a number of things. It has given financial aid, loans, grants and established quotas to try and help the industry in Canada which employs about 200,000 people but despite that the industry continues to decline. Companies which have been in existence for 50 years or more are going out of business. People who have worked in the industry for 20 or 30 years are losing their jobs.

What new plans does the Government have either to help the industry maintain its present position and number of employees or to find alternative methods and fields for the people who work in the industry, many of them in one-industry towns in Ontario and Quebec? They face a disastrous situation if this decline cannot be prevented.

Mr. Lumley: Mr. Speaker, I first want to say how much I appreciate the Hon. Member's kind comments with respect to the Government's efforts in terms of helping this industry restructure, providing some assistance and putting in quotas. I hope he passes on his comments to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) who obviously did not know that.

The Hon. Member raises a very important point. That is why we have decided to keep the CIRD Program. That program will not be rolled over to the new program. It will be reviewed when the CIRD Program comes up for renewal, I think in two years. Tomorrow, for example, I will be announcing approximately \$55 million in financial assistance to the textile, clothing and footwear industries. Some of those grants and repayable contributions will go to companies to help them restructure, to do some new product innovation, to purchase new equipment, to ensure they are competitive, to ensure the stability of the jobs that exist in those plants.

Other companies will be receiving assistance to help diversify the economic base of those communities in which textile, clothing and footwear industries are the major employers. We will continue our efforts in this regard. With the \$267 million budget just for the textile, clothing and footwear industries, we are hopeful that when the rationalization takes place and with the modernization of the industry, we will have one of the best in the world.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure to speak to the budget following my good friend, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Lumley). I should say at the outset that I in no way question the sincerity of his commitment to the private sector and indeed the market economy, the spirit of enterprise and the need for Canada to be competitive because of the importance Canada places on its exports, the fact that we rely upon exports for 30 per cent of our GNP. Therefore I appreciate his comments.

I say at the same time that I have some difficulty in extending that confidence to other Members of his Cabinet, including the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde). A brief historical review will clearly indicate that he is associated with the master intervenors of all time. In many respects, they do not have faith in the private sector. They do not have faith in the market economy. They do not have faith and confidence in individual Canadians' ability to do what is in the best interests of the country.

• (1140)

It is in that context that I wish to talk about the budget. I think it is fair to say that on its surface, the budget contains some positive elements. I think the Minister of Finance has used the right buzz words and said the right things. The questions that we must pose are, does he really mean what he says, is he in a position to back up what he is saying, or is it merely a political exercise recognizing that there is now no other way to go since the Government's intervention in the last three years has really killed the spirit of enterprise in the country.

We cannot overlook some of the things that the Minister of Finance has stated over the years. For example, in the introduction to the National Energy Program, at page 20 is the following:

For most Canadians, the only way to ensure that they do share in the wealth generated by oil, and to have a say in companies exploiting that resource, is to have more companies . . . like Petro-Canada.

Again at page 51:

The Government believes that a larger national public sector presence in oil and gas is the only equitable way to meet quickly our goal of increased Canadian ownership.

This is the master intervenor that has literally destroyed the Canadian private sector associated with the oil industry, particularly the drilling and the supply and service sector in Canada.

Turning now to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), has he really changed? I need only quote from the October 25 edition of *Macleans's* where the Right Hon. Prime Minister's words over the years are summarized. In 1975 he said this, and I quote:

We can't rely on the free market system any more. We need rules even if they mean that you and I end up being called Communist or Socialist.