

S.O. 22

once again become confident in the future and are willing to make substantial purchases. This renewed confidence will be an additional boost to the economic recovery now underway.

In fact, this renewed confidence in the Canadian economy has a positive impact on the small- and medium-sized businesses that work as sub-contractors for the big car manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, in my riding, I have two businesses that specialize in this sector and are expanding at a tremendous rate.

This is something to be proud of and emphasizes the positive aspects of our improved economic situation here in Canada.

It has been a long time since the people of this country saw such a good performance by their federal Government. Everywhere people are saying the Conservatives are doing a good job. Of course, there are still a few problems here and there, but our Government has an attentive ear, and with the co-operation of labour and management, we shall find solutions to those problems.

* * *

● (1415)

[English]

TRADE

FOOTWEAR IMPORT QUOTAS—CORRESPONDENCE OF MEMBER FOR LANARK-RENFREW-CARLETON

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention a letter that was sent to the Hon. Minister for International Trade (Mr. Kelleher) by the Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick). This is what he had to say about the shoe industry in this letter dated September 18:

On October 23rd, 1984, I wrote to you, Sir, as our new Minister for International Trade, and asked that if we are really serious about maintaining employment in this country, and if we are serious in ensuring that our domestic footwear manufacturing industry is competitive, then rather than a 2 year, 3 year, or 5 year quota period, I believed we should have a 10 year quota period in order to encourage the appropriate investors.

I wonder what happened to that Member, Mr. Speaker. The letter continues:

Further, on May 2nd, 1985, I wrote once again supporting a letter from our colleague, Roch LaSalle, on this matter, and again pointed out that I believed 10 years was necessary if we were seriously going to approach this problem, and try to give the appropriate lead time necessary for proper investment to bring the Canadian industry into line with the competition.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years was shortened to roughly 10 weeks after this letter was sent because of what happened to the shoe industry.

SOCIAL SECURITY

FAMILY ALLOWANCES—PROTEST AGAINST GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, many social policy groups, women, poverty groups, unions, and churches have joined forces again to protest the treatment of children and families by the Government and the cynical myth of its consultation. Their anger is repeated by over 40,000 citizens who have petitioned the Government and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) to restore full benefits to families. The Government ignores this unanimous consensus as it proceeds with legislation to deindex family allowances.

Women's groups protest the deindexing because it attacks women, especially homemakers and those raising families on their own. Poverty groups and social reformers deplore the additional hardship this puts on poor families. Catholic Bishops condemn deficit reduction policies that put restraint before human needs.

By proceeding with Bill C-70 the Government has given its message to Canadians that children are not important and parenting deserves decreased support. Canadians will long remember Christmas of 1985 when the Conservatives took benefits from children. The silent victims are kids.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

SALE OF DE HAVILLAND—SUPPORT FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, for the last few days this House has been subjected to both Liberal and NDP rhetoric concerning the Government's sale of de Havilland to Boeing. Through their usual manipulation of the facts they give the Canadian public the impression that the Government is selling off one of our most prized possessions for a ridiculously low price. The Opposition has made de Havilland appear to be Canada's "Jewel in the Crown". Nothing could be further from the truth.

What the opposition Parties neglected to tell the Canadian public was that over the last 11 years the Canadian taxpayer has poured over \$800 million into de Havilland and it is still losing money. Last year this company lost \$40.3 million, and in the first nine months of this year it lost another \$55 million. How long do Canadian taxpayers have to pump their hard-earned tax dollars into such a venture?

As reported in *The Globe and Mail* today, even the Liberal Premier of Ontario recognizes the necessity of selling Crown corporations, such as its Urban Transportation Development Corporation, which no longer fulfil a public policy purpose. It is interesting to note that in an edition of *The Toronto Star* this week it is mentioned that as far back as 1974 the federal Liberals pledged that they would sell de Havilland back to the private sector. Now the federal Liberals are crying about de Havilland's sale. What a bunch of hypocrites.