

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, we really have to feel sorry for this fellow. In spite of the fact that the Treasury makes hundreds of thousands of dollars available to help the Hon. Member with researchers, he relies on a news story out of a 25-cent newspaper. He refers to a turn-down of Canada Packers and implies that somehow or other we did that. He totally ignores the fact that it was the former Government—

Mr. Axworthy: Oh no, it wasn't.

Mr. Stevens:—and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry as the western Cabinet Minister who turned down Canada Packers. We have indicated that if the company wants to reapply, we will look at it. We will deal with it fairly and judiciously. But do let him not start blaming some mythical \$200 million figure as being the problem for the turn-down of Canada Packers. It was the former Government itself which turned it down.

Mr. Axworthy: No, it wasn't.

Mr. Stevens: As far as the Melrose Food Company is concerned, again, poor fellow, it is a subsidiary of the major international conglomerate known as Nabisco. We offered it \$300,000, but we said we thought, in view of the fact that it was a very profitable company, that perhaps it would care to repay the money. That is the only difference. It has indicated it would like an outright grant.

Mr. Darling: Who wouldn't?

Mr. Stevens: Notwithstanding the fact that it is a multi-national—and at other times the Hon. Member is very critical of these multi-nationals, he has a little bit of hate for them—in this instance he says, "Give it the money. How dare you ask that it should ever repay the \$300,000?" That's what the Hon. Member is talking about. And on the strength of the article out of that 25-cent newspaper, he feels he has something to stand up and expound on in this House. It is pitiful, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on behalf of the men and women of Quebec. In his comments, the Minister mentioned that he was happy with the agreement signed with the province of Quebec. In that case, I would like to ask the Minister why the first thing his Government did was to cut \$770 million from the amount to be transferred to Quebec this year. They are bragging about signing a billion-dollar agreement, but the money is to be spent over a period of five years.

As far as equalization is concerned, Mr. Speaker, not the Liberals but the Quebec Minister of Finance, Mr. Duhaime, has been saying that he disagrees with the decisions made by the Progressive Conservative Government... Mr. Speaker, unemployment figures may have gone down in Quebec, but this morning, we heard that the problem is not unemployment but 700,000 people who are drawing welfare benefits. That is what your policies have brought us!

Supply

[*English*]

Mr. Stevens: The Hon. Member has referred to certain funding with respect to the Province of Quebec which he says we have scrapped. I would like him to document that. I know of no funding which has been scrapped. In fact, we have grandfathered the various programs which had been identified for Quebec, and clearly the agreement which we have with Quebec not only says that whatever funding was directed toward Quebec would stay in place, but that there would be new supplemental funding. The new funding of \$415 million in total, to which I referred, includes an industrial development agreement for \$175 million; tourism, \$50 million; communications, \$20 million; cultural infrastructures, \$20 million, and forestry, \$130 million. That is just the federal share. The total agreement comes to \$830 million because those agreements are all on a fifty-fifty basis. In short, the Province of Quebec received an add-on in addition to whatever had been earmarked for it previously.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The time for questions and comments is now completed. Resuming debate.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex-Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I have to start out by congratulating my hon. friend in the Liberal Party for moving this motion.

Mr. Stevens: What else is new?

Mr. Langdon: He has, I think, made the heroic discovery that in fact there are, on the part of this Government, industrial policies. I have watched and looked carefully since September 4 and I have not been able to detect any policies or any direction, so I have to say that it is heroic and admirable that my hon. colleague has been able to identify such a thing. It is a particular pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to speak this morning on the aftermath of yet another vote of judgment on the policy direction of the Conservative federal Government. I refer, of course, to Yukon and to the fact that the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) has received his welcome reward for the long months of work he has contributed.

I must start out by telling you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens) has been referred to this morning as an "enigma". I frankly think that one of the most difficult challenges in this House of Commons is to pinpoint exactly what the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion is trying to do. I spent this morning, Mr. Speaker, jogging, as I find occasionally I have to do in order to cope with the frustration of trying to understand the direction of the Minister. It came to me, finally, as I jogged across the laws of the Governor General's house this morning, that in fact we are talking not about an enigma, but about an octopus, the octopus of the 1980s, the Hon. Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion. His arms stretch out in all directions. Everything from IRDP to Devco to IRDA agreements, his arms are everywhere. Yet there is a kind of writhing quality about those arms, which betrays the lack of direction and strategy. There is also, characteristic of the octopus, a camouflage of ink spewed in all directions, trying to obscure, hide