

cent of all shoes sold in Quebec are manufactured not in Canada but in other countries specially in Europe.

Practically the same, Mr. Speaker, may be said concerning electrical appliances. Our manufacturers are not better off with Mr. Parizeau's tax reduction. He should have moved in favour of those industries as that sector has lost the greatest number of jobs because European and Japanese products are more competitive. We should improve employment in this industry where wages are quite high. With respect to textiles, that industry did not develop so well, even though it is not true for the whole of the industry, but certain areas of that industry have failed to remodel or automate their facilities as fast as was done elsewhere and wages did not follow the general trend in Canada. Mr. Speaker, that sector should have been helped instead of the shoe industry, for instance, because a high percentage of those products are not manufactured in the province of Quebec.

The same applies to all appliances, washing machines, dryers, and also carpeting, Mr. Speaker. There is a carpet manufacture in my riding and as I said earlier, the workers in that plant are simply insulted because they cannot benefit from that sales tax reduction. Once again, I wonder why the union has not yet staged a demonstration to show that they disagree with the economic policy of the government of the province of Quebec.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that it is economically unsound to think that it is possible to put the economy back on its feet by favouring one, two, three or even four individual industries. When the industrial incentive program was developed, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion just about ignored sectorial industries and gave special assistance to the development of certain geographical areas and it is rather along that line that Quebec should have taken action.

If there were a proposal to be made, if for some reason the Quebec government wanted to encourage the industrial community in the province, they should have offered a proposal, they should have first responded to the proposal made by our Minister of Finance and suggested that some of the provisions in the program be made applicable in some areas of the province rather than in some others, or that some areas be excluded from the program, and not have discriminated against certain industries. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I say this here, as I would do elsewhere, and this is the place to do so, I support without reserve the provisions included in the budget which the Minister of Finance has brought forward and I hope that the media will play the role which morally is theirs. I am referring especially to those in the province of Quebec which will consider the proposal made by the Minister of Finance, the national proposition, before it is too late. Because, on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, one cannot try to make the people of the province of Quebec believe in sovereignty-association and pretend to be open to any proposal or any offer, and on the

Income Tax Act

other hand to scorn any proposal coming from the federal government. Those people do not seem to realize that they lose all credibility and that all they deserve is the scorn of business circles in the province of Quebec towards an administration as clumsy and as unhealthy for the economy of the province.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Dupras: Yes.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I wonder if the hon. member, who is a good friend, would like to compare the situation of taxpayers in Quebec, given the current proposal of the Minister of Finance, and that of taxpayers from the province of Alberta. It has even been suggested that the Minister of Finance said that he had agreed to make concessions in favour of the oil industry in the province of Alberta in the future, perhaps for the next five to eight years. Now what is the taxpayer from the province of Alberta going to gain from that, considering that all taxpayers should be treated the same way? I am asking you for a new proposal because the Alberta taxpayer is definitely at a disadvantage compared to some—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order.

Mr. Dupras: Mr. Speaker, this question is becoming a speech but I would like to say to my friend and colleague from Edmonton West that I had written a note here to remind me to talk about the compensation program for Alberta oil prices and the openmindedness of the Alberta government. You will be surprised, Mr. Speaker, and my colleague will be surprised too when I tell them how much I admire the Alberta government and the Albertans who agreed to contribute to relieve the population of the province of Quebec—I refer to Quebec because this province is involved in the tax reduction program—by accepting the oil prices compensation program which has already benefited the people of the province of Quebec to the tune of \$3 billion. And the Albertans, and I say so because it is exactly what happened, did not try to finesse with the Department of Finance or the 1974 federal proposal. They agreed and indeed it is partly taxes which might be paid to Alberta that Albertans have agreed to surrender to Quebecers.

As for the other part of his question, Mr. Speaker, there are some provisions in the budget which favour the citizens of Alberta. He is acquainted as well as I am with those provisions. So the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) agrees with me as he often does, Mr. Speaker. There is also the speech made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner)—

An hon. Member: Just read the speech made by the Minister of Industry Trade and Commerce!