

Employment Incentive Programs

one can also consider the cost of what is known as the farm assistance, which represents about \$21 per person. That can be compared with similar per capita amounts—\$22 or \$28 according to the situation—paid in some regions of Quebec. An amount of \$97 per person is granted in the Atlantic region.

• (2040)

Insofar as I know, the Prairie provinces have also benefited from the industrial incentive programs; if one considers the statistics for February, 214 offers had been accepted, taking into account an investment of \$180 million, thus creating about 8,150 jobs.

For the whole of Canada, if we consider the old industrial incentives act, administered by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion for the benefit of certain regions, 19,600 jobs have been created. The difference between the number of jobs created and the number anticipated is below 2 per cent, which is a very interesting result.

One could also consider the achievements, the programs and the policy established within the jurisdiction of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. According to one of the latest reports of that department, the budget earmarks an amount of \$75,400,000 for grants and various contributions.

There are other statutory programs, of which the general incentive program IRDIA representing \$30,100,000, the Automotive Assistance Program, \$11 million and the DIP program, to help modernize the Canadian defence program, amounting to some \$6,700,000.

Those grants and subsidies amount to a total of \$123,200,000.

I shall only mention as well the program the same department adopted to help shipbuilding in Canada; everyone knows that this Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce program was of immeasurable assistance to the workers in Canadian shipyards.

In closing, I should like to mention an important detail: it seems strange that hon. members of the opposition always seem to see the gloomy side of Canada, while other countries—and the OECD for instance—consider that Canadian economic growth in 1971 ranked amongst the highest in the world. One of the leading newspapers in England, the *Times*, gave Canada first prize for the best general economic evolution amongst all industrialized countries in the western world.

[*English*]

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity of becoming involved in this debate because I think the motion before the House is meaningful. May I bring to your attention, Sir, something I learned as a result of being involved with the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration when it was dealing with Bill C-183.

When I was asked to become involved in the debate on this motion it suddenly dawned on me that a strange anomaly has developed in this country. On one hand the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has earmarked millions of dollars for innovation—or technologi-

[Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski).]

cal change, if you will—and has been saying to industry and manufacturers, "Come and see us; we will grant you money in order to make you more competitive in domestic and international markets." On the other hand, because technological changes, as defined in the act, are being encouraged the government has said that collective agreements which have been closed may be reopened. In other words, the effects of technological change may be looked into and if labour and management do not reach a new agreement a strike may ultimately result.

That is the anomaly to which I refer. On one hand the government gives money to industry in order to place it in a more competitive position, while on the other hand and at the same time it is strangling industry. If a collective agreement which is closed, is opened and no new agreement is reached, labour can use its ultimate weapon, the strike—the weapon which is being increasingly questioned.

We are all concerned about full employment and economic growth. Now and again, however, we must place our finger on and be concerned about—I say this with all due respect—those who are directly involved in this process. We have discussed this question at length. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I come from an industrial city of which I am proud. Voluminous legislation is produced affecting those in business who must decide how to increase productivity. Businessmen tell me that almost every time they turn around, a new law comes down. For the big company this is fine; it has the wherewithal for high-priced lawyers, accountants, public relations men, lobbies, and so on. Big companies can afford to sit down, peruse and analyse government legislation as it is passed almost each month.

I am concerned about the small chap, the businessman who does not have that sort of wherewithal. How is he to survive? Where is he to get his advice? From the *Globe and Mail*? From the *Hamilton Spectator*? Will those newspapers tell him how he is to move and what his rights are? I am greatly concerned about the type of legislation this government passes. I will not discuss this question at great length; I merely wish to put on record my thoughts. This government is hypocritical. It has indicated that it supports full employment, economic growth and helping the helpless whether they be individuals or organizations in the corporate structure; at the same time, however, it has passed legislation that is bound to create frustration, confusion, disenchantment—

Mr. Munro: And consternation.

Mr. Alexander: —and consternation, as the minister says.

An hon. Member: What's his name?

Mr. Alexander: Yes, what's his name?

Mr. MacKay: The minister of wealth and hell fare!

Mr. Alexander: Bills such as the one I referred to, which deal with labour matters, give rise to consternation. I thank the minister for suggesting the word.

Something else bothers many people, particularly those this government expects to carry the load in the private